LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 2 1916
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BP 941
.S41S43

Division

Section

The Truth About Christian Science

BY

GEORGE M. SEARLE

of the Paulist Fathers

New York
THE PAULIST PRESS
120 West 60th Street
1916

Copyright, 1916, by "The Missionary Society of
St. Paul the Apostle in the State
of New York"

Nihil Obstat:

REMIGIUS LAFORT, S.T.D.,

Censor

Imprimatur:

✠JOHN CARDINAL FARLEY,

Archbishop of New York

New York, February 7, 1916.

PREFACE

Of all the delusions, in the matter of religion, which have at any time gained credence among apparently intelligent people, the most surprising, perhaps, is that known in recent times as "Christian Science." It is quite obvious that, as has been well remarked, it is neither Christian nor Science. For a doctrine professing to be *Christian* should (as is evident) be one founded on the words of Christ as a whole, which the person holding such a doctrine endeavors to explain in their genuine sense; rather than on theories which he himself has elaborated, and supports, here and there, by such words of Christ as he can manage to fit to suit his purpose. Also, a system professing to be scientific should rest on a solid basis of fact, and be stated clearly and distinctly, not in vague generalities, which are either truisms or have no precise meaning whatever. A scientific system should be in some way a contribution to our knowledge. But the most favorable criticism on the lucubration known as "Christian Science" would be that it contains "some things which are new, and some things which are true; but the things which are true are not new, and the things which are new are not true."

The book of Mrs. Eddy's, known as *Science and Health,* and on which it all rests, has been gladly received by many people, and more so than such attempts usually would have been at the time when it appeared; and this because it professed to obtain, and from the Bible, results of value, not so much for the world to

come, as for that which now is. As is indicated by its title, it claimed that the right understanding of the doctrine of Christ would give to those who obtained it a perfect freedom from bodily as well as spiritual disease. It told us that there was no need of waiting for another life to be free from the chief pain and suffering which we have here; indeed that there was no reality in what we seem to feel in that way, even now; and that the main object of Christ's work in this world was to heal the sick, or rather those who imagined themselves to be sick. Get rid of this nonsense about being sick, and you will be as well as anybody else; that was the fundamental idea of Mrs. Eddy.

But to impress this idea more firmly on her own mind and on those of her readers, she saw that it would help very much if she could persuade herself and them, that there was no real existence in the body in which they thought they were sick; and going even further, that there was no reality in the mind, which could entertain such erroneous ideas; that nothing had any real existence except the divine Mind, which is incapable of this or any other error. And consequently that there was no such thing as creation by that Mind of anything outside of itself. It was, however, necessary to have something in which these errors could be located. She could not help seeing this. So she boldly gave a name to it, and called it "mortal mind," and let it go at that. So far her absurdities were chiefly philosophical. But hoping that they would not be noticed, she does not consistently stick to them, but continually drops them, and talks about what she tries to discuss according to the notions generally prevalent, or, in other words, to common sense; and even ventures to bring physical science, as generally accepted, to help

her out. But her ignorance on these lines is so palpable that she only entangles herself more and more by it, as well as by her inconsistency.

The more intelligent among her adherents have for a good while perceived this, and have become sufficiently aware that *Science and Health* is not a book which can bear examination. They hope that it can be kept in the background, and try to put the "catching" ideas of it in a shape that will not be so fatal. But this way of proceeding, though it may succeed for a time, has no right to do so. They have no right, even on their own professed beliefs, to do what they are now attempting. For the book professes to be the result of a Divine inspiration or illumination given to Mrs. Eddy herself. If it proves not to be that, it has no value whatever.

Let us, then, proceed to look in detail at Mrs. Eddy's *Science and Health,* with which, whether it was actually written by her or not, this so-called "Christian Science" stands or falls. It seems better to take its actual words, which, in imitation of our version of Sacred Scripture, are kindly divided into chapters and something like verses, for better reference, than to attempt the task, evidently too much for herself, of constructing a system from them, which her followers could easily disclaim; and it is really fairer to herself and to them. Our chapters will correspond with her own.

The book itself is entirely destitute of any order or system, and therefore compels any review or examination of it to be of a somewhat similar character. It has, of course, a few leading or principal notions, which are continually repeated, indiscriminately, in all parts of it. But if these were sifted out of its mass

of verbiage, it might be urged that the sifting had been unfairly done, and did not correctly represent the author. So the only possible course seems to be to go through with the book in its own actual pretence of order, taking these false notions when they are most prominently stated, and with them the other absurdities which she intersperses with them, and serve best to show her utter ignorance of the subjects of which she attempts to treat. The errors into which she continually falls, have been broached often before, and defended far more ably than she was able to defend them; and shown to be inconsistent with anything which could pretend to be any kind of Christian doctrine, or even with reason itself. But the most effectual way to show this falsity seems to be to illustrate the effects which they had on her own deluded mind, and the preposterous ideas which she associates with them.

In general, we have treated of them from a point of view common to all Christians who have any positive system of religion as a revelation; but sometimes we have stated more emphatically the Catholic teaching on the matters concerned, as notably in the opening chapters, where it seemed to be more specially necessary.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Prayer	1
Atonement and Eucharist	6
Marriage	33
Christian Science and Spiritualism	44
Animal Magnetism	57
Science, Theology, Medicine	60
"Theology"	89
"Medicine"	93
Physiology	99
"Footsteps of Truth"	102
Creation	114
Science of Being	121
Some Objections Answered	165
Christian Science Practice	176
Teaching Christian Science	192
Recapitulation	197
"Key to the Scriptures"	216
Key to the Apocalypse	227
Fruitage	233
General Remarks	294

THE

Truth About Christian Science

CHAPTER I.

Prayer.

This opening chapter has for its title, "Prayer." Its first words are: "The prayer that reforms the sinner and heals the sick is an absolute faith that all things are possible to God." This article of faith is one of the truisms to which we have alluded; that is to say, for those who believe in the existence of God at all. It does not, however, require any faith, properly so called, to endorse this statement. It is perfectly ascertainable by unaided reason; at least if we do not take it as applying to what are called metaphysical impossibilities, such as that a thing can be and not be at the same time. But it is fair to admit that this would also be her own understanding of the matter.

It can, of course, besides being a matter of reason, be one of faith also. If we are rationally convinced of the existence of a God, properly so-called, and He tells us that all things are possible to Him, we can take His word for it. For that is the genuine meaning of the word "faith," the belief of a statement on the word of another; though inaccurate writers like Mrs. Eddy often confuse it with "belief" in general.

However, we must get on a little faster than this. Let us look at the rest of these opening words. "The prayer," she says, is an "absolute faith." If she had said that it "*requires* an absolute faith," it would have been all right, though the words "an absolute" are

superfluous. But prayer, even according to her own words, is more than this. For it includes, as she goes on to say, "a spiritual understanding, an unselfed love." Faith, to reform a sinner, does require love, certainly; and hope also. But that love is required, to heal the sick, is not so clear. St. Paul seems to say that it is not needed to move mountains (1 Cor. xiii. 2). But Mrs. Eddy speaks of "unselfed" love. Here we leave the region of truisms, and enter that of meaningless phrases. What is meant by "unselfed" love? You can't keep self altogether out of love, for though not self is not necessarily the object of love, it is the agent in it. If it is love on the part of the sinner or of the sick, as seems to be the notion, they themselves must feel it, and act according to it, just as they themselves are the ones to have the "spiritual understanding" alluded to. But really at this rate we shall never get through the book, or even get a good dose of it. It was, however, hardly possible to deny ourselves this little gem of thought with which it begins.

She goes on. "Thoughts unspoken are not unknown to the Divine Mind." We should think not. Another truism. What kind of a Divine Mind would it be, to which they were unknown? Next, she says, "desire is prayer." Not at all; desire may be purely a natural affair, having no relation to God at all. For example, what prayer is there in a desire for a good meal, already prepared, and waiting for us? Still less is there in a desire which one knows to be sinful. Even a good desire is not necessarily a prayer. It may be what is known as an "inefficacious" desire, which one would not carry out, even if knowing the ability to do so.

But she now leaves the line of mere vagueness and inaccuracy, and enters that of absolute and fundamental error. "God," she says, "is not moved by the breath of praise to do more than He has already done, nor can the infinite do less than bestow all good." The error of this statement is quite obvious. If God is not moved by the "breath of praise," there is no reason why He should be moved by anything else that we can do; and that is really what she means. According to this, if the farmer wants the Lord to give him a harvest, it makes no difference whether he himself plants the seed for it or not. This is a common and superficial objection made to prayer, but it would apply just as well to any exertion on our part. The idea is that God has determined what He is going to do, independently of any action of ours. It seems, to those who make this objection, that this indifference to our action is required by His foreknowledge of the future. But the fact is that the case of prayer or of other actions which we may perform are really precisely parallel. The Lord, of course, knows what our action, whether of praying, or of sowing the seed, is going to be. And in both cases, equally, His action corresponds to ours. In both cases His action is less than it would be if we ourselves did not act. In both cases, if we do not act, He actually does not "bestow the good" (to use Mrs. Eddy's own words) that He would have bestowed if we had. There is no ground for making the distinction which she makes between the result on ourselves and on other matters. If the result, outside of ourselves, is to be the same whether we pray or not, the same rule would apply to our own interior.

In praying, no sensible person ever tries, as Mrs.

Eddy seems to suppose, "to give information to the infinite Mind of God." Possibly she might, at some time in her previous history, have made such attempts. But she seems to have finally arrived at the reasonable conviction that they would be futile, even for herself.

This false conception of prayer runs through the whole chapter. Another form of it, however, seems deserving of special mention. She says, "simply asking that we may love God will never make us love Him." These words show that she has no idea of the function or the efficacy of Divine grace. As far as we can judge, her idea is that we can, by ourselves, work ourselves up to spiritual perfection, though unable to do anything outside of ourselves. But the truth is that this work on ourselves is the most important and necessary of all for us to ask God to do for us. "It is God," says St. Paul, "Who worketh in you both to will and to do" (Phil. ii. 13). (This quotation is from her own Protestant version, which is substantially correct.) The idea that we can even start this work of ourselves is what is known as Semi-Pelagian, and condemned, not only by the Catholic Church, but by Protestants as well.

This grace of God is given to us, in the first place, without our asking for it. The same grace also moves us to ask for its increase, but is given more abundantly, if, by means of it, we ask for more. "Asking that we may love God," therefore, is really the principal and most effectual means of obtaining the love of Him, though others must not be neglected. So this error of Mrs. Eddy is of the gravest importance.

A part of this chapter on prayer seems to go on the assumption that one who prays, with the belief

that God will do something for him which he cannot himself accomplish, will, on principle, as it were, neglect any effort on his own part to obtain what he asks for. That there are some who deserve this reproach cannot be doubted, but that such is the universal, or even the general, rule among pious or prayerful Christians is simply preposterous. We trust that the author herself did not belong to this class, but the sweeping character of her assertions seems to strongly suggest that the idea of serious efforts for self-amendment was rather a new one to her until she arrived at the conviction that prayer, in the usual sense, must be dropped before such efforts could be begun. That they must be persistently made is very true, and constantly insisted on by all spiritual writers; but it seems to have been a sort of novelty to her. It is one of the many doctrines on which she is inclined to dwell, which may be classed as true, but by no means new.

"Seeking," she says, "is not sufficient. It is striving that enables us to enter." It really never seems to enter her head that we might perhaps combine the two.

The main trouble with this poor woman, whose attempts in the line of religion we are obliged to criticize, on account of the harm which circumstances have enabled them to do, is simply ignorance of the subjects she undertakes to discuss.

We ought not to conclude this chapter without a few words on Mrs. Eddy's attempt to improve the Lord's Prayer. It is true that she gives it as what she understands to be its "spiritual sense;" as if Our Lord Himself did not know much about the spiritual sense of things. Commentaries on it are, of

course, quite lawful, in which the actual words are strictly adhered to, and made the subject of reverent meditation. But there is not much, if any, doubt that she expected and intended hers to be used as a substitute for the actual Divine words. It seems to us sacrilegious to give it here, though it may suit those to do so who regard Mrs. Eddy as a being superior to Our Lord and Saviour, and as possessed of the perfect knowledge of Christian Science, of which He was only quite an imperfect student.

CHAPTER II.

Atonement and Eucharist.

In reading this chapter, one can hardly help being moved to compassion for the writer. Like many other Reformers of the Reformation, notably Emanuel Swedenborg, she was apparently, and probably as a matter of fact, in total ignorance of the true Christian teaching against which the unfortunate protest of the sixteenth century was made. Orthodox Christianity, in her mind, is identical with Lutheranism. She evidently imagines that it does not suppose the sinner to be actually freed from his sin, but only to be able to prevent God from punishing it, by means of the merits of Christ. "If the sinner," she says, "continues to pray and repent, sin and be sorry, he has little part in the atonement—in the at-one-ment with God—for he lacks the practical repentance which reforms the heart and enables man to do the will of wisdom."

She does not seem to have the least notion that this last is exactly what the Catholic Church means, and always has meant, by repentance and atonement.

Union with God, after estrangement from Him; this is precisely what the Church understands to be produced or caused by the atonement of Christ, and by His grace in our souls which that atonement procures for us, when accepted by faith in it, and by true repentance and the firm purpose to abandon, by that grace, the sin which separates us from Him. She imagines that, according to us, the sinner is sorry for his sin, just as he might be sorry for having caught the smallpox, but goes on with it just the same; that his repentance is not real and practical; as she plainly enough says, in the words of hers, quoted above.

She is quite right in saying that "if living in disobedience to Him, we ought to feel no security, although God is good." But this is far from being an original idea with her, for it is what we keep continually saying to all our Catholic people, and is just what they themselves thoroughly believe.

"Thou shalt call His name *Jesus;* for He shall save His people from their sins." Not merely from the punishment which their sins deserve; but from the sins themselves. That is the real genuine Christian teaching, and always has been.

But the Church does not hold or teach that this utter and complete freedom from sin is successfully accomplished, always and in the smallest matters, even by the best Christian, except by a very special grace and help from God. We do not believe that Mrs. Eddy herself accomplished it, and think that there is pretty good evidence that she did not; and that is not making any serious charge against her. But even if her followers choose to imagine that such was the case, to claim this for every genuine "Christian Scientist" would involve a great strain, even on their

credulity. But everyone, centuries before Mrs. Eddy was born, acknowledged that to live in this way is the ideal and aim of true religion, and one theoretically in the reach of all of us. This is simply the old-fashioned "Christian Science" known to Christians in general; not any new discovery of hers.

Though having correct and normal views in this respect, as just described, Mrs. Eddy and her "Christian Science" of course go astray in the doctrine of the atonement in other important matters. Indeed, they cannot help doing so, as they fail to recognize the great fact on which our redemption, properly so-called, rests; that is to say, that of original sin. This is, in great measure, due to her ignorance of anything but the exaggeration of this fact often taught in Protestant theology. But this matter is also connected with other parts of her scheme, and cannot well be discussed till later on in our examination of it.

In common with others, Unitarians for example, she is driven by this ignorance to confine herself to a very inadequate view of the work accomplished by our Divine Lord. "The efficacy of the crucifixion she says, "lay in the practical affection and goodness it demonstrated for mankind." It is, of course, quite true that it has immense efficacy in that way, and this is quite generally recognized by all Christians, and by none more than by the Catholic Church. Our devotions largely rest on this, and are emphasized by us continually, particularly in those to the Sacred Heart and the Precious Blood. But it will not do to confine religion entirely to this. It is a characteristic of all heresies, and of none more than this particular one, to make special capital of some par-

ticular points, and to ignore everything else which does not seem to fit in with them, and of which they would hide the evidence, as far as possible. There is a notable instance of this in the very paragraph from which the words just quoted are taken. "The truth," Mrs. Eddy goes on to say, "had been lived among men, but until they saw that it enabled their Master to triumph over the grave, His own disciples would not admit such an event to be possible."

We must stop for a moment just here to note the utter confusion of thought into which she falls. "The efficacy of the crucifixion," she has just told us, "lay in practical affection and goodness." Now she makes it consist in truth. But "affection and goodness" are not synonyms for truth. Of course goodness consists partially, but only partially, in truth; but affection has no special relation to it. However, let that pass. She seems to mean that the disciples saw that affection and goodness, rather than truth, "enabled their Master to triumph over the grave." The natural thing for them to see in this triumph was *power,* rather than affection or goodness. But those determined on some particular line see only what they want to see. So she goes on, it suiting her purpose that the disciples should see only what will help that purpose along. "After the resurrection," she proceeds, "soon the unbelieving Thomas was forced to acknowledge how complete was the great proof of Truth and Love." Now she lugs in Truth again, as if it was the same as Love. The actual fact, however, which impressed St. Thomas evidently had no particular connection with either Truth or Love. He recognized, of course, by the event, that Our Lord had told the truth in saying that He would rise from

the dead; but what carried conviction to him was that He was *able,* in fact, to verify His words. What St. Thomas actually said was, simply, "My Lord and my God!" This was not a mere ejaculation; it evidently meant, "My Lord must indeed have been God to be able to do this stupendous thing."

But this would not suit Mrs. Eddy. She does not believe that Our Lord was really and truly God, any more than that she is so herself. There is no need, in her system, for Him to be so. According to it, He is to be merely a great Teacher of her Christian or Eddian "science," who was enlightened in it by the Deity, just in the same way as she is herself. Of course, for her own credit and reputation, His teaching must not differ from hers.

She goes on to say, "The spiritual essence of blood is sacrifice." If she had said "meaning" instead of "essence," she would have been more correct. "The efficacy of Jesus' spiritual offering," she continues, "is infinitely greater than can be expressed by our sense of human blood." Now, you see, she drops the idea of sacrifice, for the word "offering" with her has no such sense. His Blood now, with her, no longer retains any meaning of sacrifice, but simply becomes the blood of His ordinary life. "The material blood of Jesus," she tells us, "was no more efficacious to cleanse from sin when it was shed upon 'the accursed tree,' than when it was flowing in His veins as He went daily about His Father's business. His true flesh and blood were His Life, and they truly eat His flesh and drink His blood who partake of that divine Life."

There is a partial truth in this, which is recognized by the Catholic Church, and indeed by Christians

generally, especially when treating of the Holy Eucharist. The idea is not at all new to any of us. In that great Sacrament, and at other times also, we are not partaking of the dead flesh of Jesus, or of His blood separated from it, but of Christ Himself living, in His Body and Blood, in His Soul and Divinity. All this we receive, as the Catholic catechism teaches even our children, when we receive Holy Communion, even only in the form of bread. We are partaking of the life of Christ, even of His Divine Life. If Mrs. Eddy had not been so ignorant about Catholic doctrine or practice, she would hardly have given this out as if it were her own discovery. The chief motive or reason why we receive Communion at all, is because it is the Food of the Divine Life in us. But besides there is another motive, which is given by our Blessed Lord Himself in the Gospels, and even more explicitly by St. Paul writing to the Corinthians, "As often," he says, "as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). (Again we quote from the Protestant version, as being familiar to Mrs. Eddy's followers.)

How do "we show" the Lord's death by it? Evidently, according to the teaching of the Church from the beginning, by the separate representation of His Body and Blood. "Christ, rising again from the dead, dieth now no more; death shall no more have dominion over Him" (Rom. vi. 9). His Body and Blood are now and forever united. But it is of the highest importance for us to remember and commemorate the fact that they were once separated on the Cross, and that all the Divine Life which we have is due to this.

Mrs. Eddy assumes that we all have a right to this Divine Life, and that all that we need is to have it shown to us. According to her, "this Divine Principle heals the sick, casts out error, and triumphs over death;" and all that we have to do is to recognize this fact, as He did. In her view, He only helps us to do so by His example; He does not bring the Divine Life to us in any way except by showing where it is to be found. As she goes on to say, He simply "presented the ideal of God, better than could any man whose origin was less spiritual;" perhaps a little better, but not much, than Mrs. Eddy herself could.

But that this Divine Life is offered to us by virtue of any thing that He has done, she of course does not admit. She has no idea that the Atonement, according to genuine Christian doctrine, has anything to do with this. All that she knows about it is an incomplete statement of it.

"Does erudite theology," she asks, "regard the crucifixion of Jesus chiefly as providing a ready pardon for all sinners who ask for it and are willing to be forgiven?" We hardly know of any theology, "erudite" or not, which goes on this idea. Almost all actual Christian theology requires more than this. But true theology requires that the sinner should have much more than simply be "willing to be forgiven." It teaches that he must really repent of his sin, which means that he must abandon it; knowing that by means of the Precious Blood of Christ, shed for him, he has the grace and strength to enable him to do so. But poor Mrs. Eddy has no idea of "erudite" Christian doctrine except that it holds that the sinner must go on sinning, but be forgiven—or more properly

speaking, excused—for his sin, because Christ has taken on Himself the punishment due to it.

Her alternative for this idea is, as she frankly seems to confess, the spiritualistic one; which does not regard the Crucifixion as in any way important, but which takes the Resurrection as a proof "that spirits can return to earth;" or rather, as she means to say, that the spirit can survive bodily death. Really, of course, it proves much more than this; but at present, in the general wreck of faith outside the Church, that seems a great deal to many. Besides these two ideas, she seems to have no idea of the existence of any other concerning the Death of our Blessed Lord. "We must differ from them both," she says. These two being discarded as insufficient, she considers that hers is established.

The truisms which she often triumphantly brings out are really quite pathetic. For instance, a little further on, she remarks: "Implicit faith in the Teacher and all the emotional love we can bestow on Him, will never alone make us imitators of Him." Did ever anyone seriously allege that they would? "We must go and do likewise," she sagely remarks, as if the idea were quite original; whereas it is essential to Christianity, and always has been. "Be ye therefore followers of God, as most dear children," says St. Paul (Eph. v. 1), and he is continually urging this.

The remainder of this chapter is, like the whole body of the book, mainly composed of statements, more or less vague, which everybody acknowledges, or of others which have no precise meaning at all. It is, of course, impossible to go over them all; we must be content to show up some samples of

them. One notable example occurs shortly after those which have been quoted, and is as follows: "There is a tradition," she tells us, "that Publius Lentulus wrote to the authorities at Rome: The disciples of Jesus believe Him the Son of God. Those instructed in Christian Science have reached the glorious perception that God is the only author of man." She seems to imagine that what was meant by the disciples, in calling Jesus the Son of God, was that He was the creation of God, whereas people in general were created by somebody else. To this she opposes the "glorious perception" that every human being, as well as Himself, had God for his author (or creator). We had an idea that everyone who believes in God as the Creator of all, as the first article of the Christian Creed states, had this "glorious perception" as fully as any "Christian Scientist." It seems, however, to have been new to Mrs. Eddy, before she got up her "science."

"The Virgin-mother," she goes on to say, "conceived this idea of God, and gave to her ideal the name of Jesus." We fancied, in our ignorance of "Science," that Jesus really existed, and was not a mere "ideal."

Of course, in fact, what was understood by calling Jesus the Son of God, in the minds of the first Christians and in those of the immense majority of all their followers, was that He actually had the same Divine Nature as His Father; that He was really and truly God, in the most absolute and complete sense; that He was the Uncreated, and in His Divine Nature not a creation of God at all. The Arians, in order to avoid the ineffable mystery of this, held that His Nature was only similar to that of the

Father, but not really precisely identical with it; that He held a kind of intermediate place between God and the creation, and was a means through which creation was accomplished. But they would not admit that His Being was, like that of the Father, from eternity; so that after all it followed that however perfect His likeness to God might be in other ways, it failed in that point. The words of St. Paul, describing Him as "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature" (Col. i. 15), were understood by them to mean, not "*born* before anything was created, but simply the first of all creatures to be created." They had, when pressed, to acknowledge that they regarded Him, though standing, as it were, on a different plane from other creatures, and existing before any other, and an agent in the creation of others, to be really Himself a creation as well as they.

But of course Mrs. Eddy makes no such distinction as the Arians endeavored to make. For her, He was simply a creature like any other; God was His "author"—whatever that may mean—and the surprising discovery which she makes is that God is also the only "author" of all men.

She seems to imagine that the world, before she came to enlighten it, regarded matter as something quite independent of God, and that "its order of generation" was something which was believed to work of its own energy, not coming from God in any way. For she says in her next paragraph: "This illumination of Mary's spiritual sense put to silence material law and its order of generation, and brought forth her child by the revelation of Truth, demonstrating God as the Father of men."

As if, forsooth, the ineffable mystery of the Incarnation only showed that a human child could be produced without the regular "order of generation;" that "material law" could not prevail against Him Who established it. And as if this, which everyone believes who believes in God at all, proved that there is no such fact as the laws of matter, which are established by Him, and, indeed, that there is no actual existence of matter. That is what she seems to mean by the sentence immediately following the one just quoted, which is as follows: "The Holy Ghost, or divine Spirit, overshadowed the pure sense of the Virgin-mother with the full recognition that being is Spirit." Which means, if it has any meaning, that there is no reality except Spirit; and we may rightly assume that it does mean this, for this is one of the absurd points—indeed a fundamental one—of Mrs. Eddy's "Science."

She proceeds, however, with the following statement: "Man, as the offspring of God, as the idea of Spirit, is the immortal evidence that Spirit is harmonious and man eternal." If this has any meaning, it is that there is no such thing as creation at all; that God cannot create anything whatever. The idea of man, in the mind of God, is of course eternal; but Mrs. Eddy makes no difference between this eternal idea, and its existence, in time, as an actual fact. According to this there would be no existence of man, even as spirit, except as the Spirit of God. Mrs. Eddy protests, now and then, against pantheism; but here it is pure and simple. Not only, according to this, is there no reality except spirit; but there is no spirit except that of God.

The one idea that nothing exists except spirit, and

which she really carried to pantheism, comes out more and more clearly, if anything can be said to be clear, in her mind. She goes on, in her next utterances, to reduce the doctrine of the Eucharist, as well as everything else, entirely to this. Its "true sense," she says, "is spiritually lost, if the sacrament is confined to the use of bread and wine." This is in a way, true; but, in fact, no one, even among Protestants, does so confine it. And there is no need to say what the Catholic Church holds about it. But Mrs. Eddy considers that the use of bread and wine was entirely a sort of "concession to matter," as she calls it, and, in her judgment, rather a weak one. She reduces the Bread which came down from heaven to the "great truth of spiritual being, healing the sick and casting out error;" as if this truth, admitted by all who are not materialists, was utterly unheard of by Christians. This, according to her, was all that He had to give them; but they knew it perfectly well before. They knew that spirit really existed; but they did not know, and neither did any other sensible person, that its mere existence heals the sick or casts out errors. And there is not the slightest trace in any records which we have that Our Lord made on this occasion, or on any other, any attempts to tell them anything of the kind. Mrs. Eddy, however, asserts that He "had explained it all before." Her followers are expected, of course, to take her word for this; but there is nobody else's word for it. "Now," she says, "this bread," that is to say this well-known and undoubted truth, which there was no need for Our Lord, or for anyone else, to explain, "was feeding and sustaining them." And she actually pretends that when we are told that the disciples bore

this "bread from house to house" (Acts ii. 46), it is merely meant that they "explained" to the people this needless platitude about "spiritual being."

The depth of poor Mrs. Eddy's ignorance about the Catholic Church is quite phenomenally shown in this chapter, though it is evident enough all through her book. She seems to have no idea of its doctrine of the Eucharist. "Are all," she says, "who eat bread and drink wine in memory of Jesus willing truly to drink His cup, take His cross, and leave all for the Christ-principle? Then why ascribe this aspirant to a dead rite, instead of showing, by casting out error and making the body 'holy, acceptable unto God,' that Truth has come to the understanding? If Christ, Truth, has come to us in demonstration, no other commemoration is requisite, for demonstration is requisite, for demonstration is Emmanuel, or *God with us;* and if a friend be with us, why need we memorials of that friend?"

She seems to have no notion that the Blessed Sacrament is believed by the immense majority of Christians to be a great deal more than simply a memorial. It is believed to be, not a Christ-principle, but Christ Himself, really and truly with us, with His Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity; *God with us,* most absolutely and completely. As a memorial, it is not merely one of Himself, but of His Death on the Cross, which Mrs. Eddy regards as of little importance, and as a reminder that we must be ready to take up our cross, so far as He may choose to give it to us. But Mrs. Eddy, by denying the reality of suffering, is compelled to ignore this part of the matter. She asks, indeed, if we are willing to "take His cross;" but this is, with her, merely a form of

words. Taking any suffering on ourselves in imitation of Him, is not her idea of the Christian life at all. The plan of her "Christian Science" is to get rid of suffering in this world, as well as in the next; or, in other words, to regard it as an "error."

She continues as follows: "If all who ever partook of the sacrament had really commemorated the sufferings of Jesus, and drunk of His cup, they would have revolutionized the world." This is very true; but it seems to common sense that the Apostles, the millions of Christian martyrs in the early days of the Church, and many also in its whole history, accomplished a good deal in that way; whereas it is contrary to what may be called the Eddy-principle, to even endeavor to do anything in that line. Many of her followers, we doubt not, really do suffer a good deal, and have been very patient in suffering; but the less they acknowledge this to Mrs. Eddy, the better; for, on her "principle," to do so would show that they are still entangled in "mortal error."

A little later she again shows her singular ignorance of Christian doctrine. She brings out the following paragraph, it would certainly appear, as an original idea with herself: "If the sinner's punishment here has been insufficient to reform him, the good man's heaven would be a hell to the sinner. They, who know not purity and affection by experience, can never find bliss in the blessed company of Truth and Love simply through translation into another sphere." This is, of course, just ordinary Catholic teaching. The sinner must be reformed, really and interiorly; not merely have a "mantle" of the righteousness of Christ (as some Protestants would say) thrown over him, to make it look as if

he were reformed. No good Christian imagines for a moment that—to quote the words of Mrs. Eddy a little later—"the wicked can gloat over their offences to the last moment, and then be suddenly pardoned and pushed into heaven." It is true that we do hope that a real conversion from sin may come, by the grace of God, at the last moment; but "pushing" an unrepentant sinner "into heaven" is something quite unheard of with us.

It is, however, by no means true, that "to remit the penalty due for sin" (when it is really repented) "would be for Truth to pardon error." Usually, in the case of post-baptismal sin, the penalty is not entirely remitted, even to the truly repentant, but, to some extent, remains for purgatory. But it may be remitted, even in this life. If it never could be remitted at all (as Mrs. Eddy seems to mean, but probably really does not), there would be rather a poor prospect for us. But we must pass on, and not spend too much time, even on such a matter as this. She is coming, even in this chapter, to her principal practical error and misunderstanding of Our Lord's words. Let us take a good look at them.

After showing, to her own satisfaction, that spirit is everything, and matter merely an "error," Mrs. Eddy starts in on what she calls "the more practical import" of Christ's career. "When," she says, "will Jesus' professed followers learn to emulate Him in *all* His ways, and to imitate His mighty works?

"Christians claim to be His followers," she continues, "but do they follow Him in the way that He commanded? Hear these imperative commands: 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect! Go ye into all the world, and

preach the Gospel to every creature! *Heal the sick!*'" Then she asks: "Why has this Christian demand so little inspiration to stir mankind to Christian effort?" And she answers: "Because men are assured that this command was intended only for a particular period and for a select number of followers." As a matter of fact, however, the great majority of Christians have never been assured, and never have believed, anything of the kind. Here, as so often elsewhere, Mrs. Eddy shows her absolute ignorance of Catholic doctrine, which is, as just remarked, that of the great majority of Christians. Catholics are never taught that the "age of miracles has passed," or that the working of them was restricted to any select number of Christ's followers. We all know that miracles are continually worked in the Church; but we also know that the working of really Divine miracles depends on an extraordinary intensity of faith, which usually is not given without a special inspiration; and not, in general, except to persons whose other virtues are also extraordinary; that is to say, to those whom we call the Saints. And, furthermore, we know that even these do not work them simply by any power residing in themselves, but by a special power given for the occasion by our Divine Lord Himself.

In the first recorded miracle of healing by the Apostles, namely, that of the cure of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, St. Peter said to those who wondered at it: "Ye men of Israel, why wonder you at this? or why look you on us, as if by our strength or power we had made this man to walk?" For in the working of it, he had said: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, arise and walk." If he had

had any power merely of his own for such things, he would have worked them on every possible occasion. But the power was reserved for the times at which, in the Infinite Wisdom of God, it would contribute most effectually to His glory.

Yes, Our Lord had indeed said of them that believe: "In My name they shall cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents; and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover" (Mark xvi. 17, 18). But He did not promise to impart to them who believe "Christian Science," by virtue of which they should learn to do on all occasions the same things which He Himself had only done now and then. He would Himself show them the proper times at which this Divine power was to be used.

And it was not, as the passage just quoted shows, to be restricted to healing the sick. But Mrs. Eddy chooses to apply it only to this. For example, we do not hear that she or any of her followers have been in the habit of "taking up serpents" or of "drinking any deadly thing." She only had made up her mind that sickness is some kind of "error," quite out of the order of Divine Providence, and even that, in fact, it has no existence. So that all that we have to do is to look it straight in the eye, and it will disappear. "Healing the sick," with her, is simply persuading them, or their persuading themselves, that they are not sick at all; and that ought to be always possible. They are in some kind of delusion about it, which must be removed.

The fact is, that it is Mrs. Eddy herself who is deluded. The great problem of the origin of evil has,

perhaps vaguely, presented itself to her, and she solves it by deciding that there is not any such problem. She is quite right in holding that there ought not to be any such problem. But unfortunately, the evidence is too plain that, in fact there is, and almost everyone except herself has common sense enough to recognize this fact. It comes from another great fact, not fully comprehensible to us, that Almighty God has chosen to leave to man the perilous power of free-will; the power to disobey instead of obeying; to take evil rather than good. This is the source of the original sin with which we are all affected; and that is the cause of all our other evils. But we shall have to leave further discussion of this matter to the later portions of this book.

But to go on with the chapter now in hand. Of course it contains her usual mixture of ambiguous sentences, truisms and errors. We shall have to mainly notice the latter. Quite an important one soon occurs, as follows:

"The educated belief," she says, "that Soul is in the body, causes mortals to regard death as a friend, as a stepping-stone out of mortality into immortality and bliss. The Bible calls death an enemy, and Jesus overcame death and the grave instead of yielding to them."

This seems to mean that Our Lord did not really die; that His death was simply a pretense. This error got some hold in the early Christian times. It hardly needs to be said that it is contradicted by what may be called innumerable passages of the New Testament; and the actual death of Christ is the most fundamental article of the Christian faith. By "death" is properly meant the separation of soul

and body. But according to the Eddy gospel, it would not do for Our Lord to die. He must "overcome" death; that is to say, according to this gospel He must, if we may say so, dodge it. "To Him," she tells us, "death was not the threshold over which He must pass into living glory." It is, perhaps, possible that Mrs. Eddy had an idea that she would be able to do as she thought that He had done. It seems to follow that if disease is only an "error," death should also be one, and that this ought to be proved in her case; though other Christian Scientists might not have "science" enough to accomplish this, she might prove to be the needed exception. At any rate, some of her disciples seem to have entertained this hope. But to proceed.

"*Now*," cried the apostle, she tells us, "is the accepted time, behold, *now* is the day of salvation; meaning, not that now men must prepare for a future world salvation or safety, but that now is the time to experience that salvation in spirit and in life."

Here, again, she fails to show any knowledge of Christian doctrine except of the kind in which she was brought up. The Catholic—though we do not believe that this is the meaning of these words of St. Paul—knows well that now is, no doubt, the time for him to experience that salvation. Anyone whose sins have been truly forgiven, and who is in the state of grace, does "experience" it as truly, thought not so completely, as those who are actually in heaven. The chief trouble is that he may fall from that state of grace.

But it is not as yet the time for anyone still in this world, as she would maintain, "for so-called material

pains and material pleasures to pass away." She says it is, "for both are unreal, because impossible in Science." Here she contradicts herself. "Jesus," she says, "experienced few of the pleasures of the physical senses." But she does not deny that He experienced some of them. As to material pains, she goes on to say, that "His sufferings were the fruits of other people's sins, not of His own." Of course we all admit that; but that did not make them any the less real.

It was not, then, the time in His case, any more than in ours, for material pains and material pleasures to pass away. Perhaps, however, He was not a complete Scientist, or quite up to Mrs. Eddy's level. She tries to explain by saying, "The eternal Christ, His spiritual self-hood, never suffered." If that means anything, it means that His Divine Nature never suffered. This of course all of those who believe in His true Divinity, believe firmly, but Mrs. Eddy does not seem to be one of them. She is in fact a Unitarian.

Poor Mrs. Eddy! She is stumbling, and tripping herself up all the time.

She now proceeds to ask, as it were, triumphantly: "Who will stop the practice of sin, as long as he believes in the pleasures of sin?" We had a notion that this was exactly what all good Christians were habitually doing. If Mrs. Eddy has not met any such, we can only say that her acquaintance has been singularly unfortunate; and it does not speak very well, indeed, for herself. For she was not always a "Scientist," and must, for a considerable time, have believed, like every person of common sense, that there are "pleasures of sin." If she means "as long as he

voluntarily indulges in the pleasures of sin," no one could find fault with her question, just quoted. But she does not mean this. For she goes on to say: "When mortals once admit that evil confers no pleasure, they turn from it;" implying, of course, the same as in her question, that they don't turn from it until they do admit this. "Remove error from thought," she says, "and it will not appear in effect." If she had meant, "remove sin," which she calls "error," *from free acts of the will,* "and it will not appear in effect," this would be, of course, quite true; it would be only saying the same thing in other words. But she evidently does not mean this.

Then she goes on with a page or two of her platitudes, such as this: "Our heavenly Father, divine Love, demands that men should follow the example of our Master and His Apostles, and not merely worship His personality." (Or, as He Himself puts it, "Why call you Me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Luke vi. 46.) All of us, of course, recognize the force of this; but Mrs. Eddy seems to imagine that until she appeared on the scene, all Christians adhered to the Lutheran doctrine that faith alone justifies us, without works. But in her system, the healing of the sick, unfortunately, stands on about the same plane as the casting out of sin, which she calls "error." Both seem to her about equally important. "The proofs of Truth, Life and Love," she says, "which Jesus gave by casting out error and healing the sick, completed his earthly mission." In point of fact, the healing of the sick was done by Him, not merely as a proof of "Truth, Life and Love," but mainly to show that He could cast out sin also, as well as bodily disease.

She proceeds, having thus put sickness and sin on the same level, to make the following astonishing statement. She seems to admit that some success has been attained by the Church in the casting out of sin; but as to healing the sick, she asserts that "in the Christian Church the demonstration of healing was early lost, about three centuries after the crucifixion." Here again she simply follows her Protestant tradition about the age of miracles having passed, being entirely ignorant of any other. But it is quite safe to say that in the Catholic Church works of healing the sick, far surpassing those which Mrs. Eddy can claim for herself or her followers, are claimed as having been done through all its history, and are now being done continually, as for example, at Lourdes. All this, however, she either does not know, or persistently ignores. This is not the place to go into the proof of this as a fact. The records were quite accessible to Mrs. Eddy, if she had cared to read them.

Speaking of the Jews, she says, a little further on: "It was enough for them to believe in a national Deity; but that belief, from their time to ours, has never made a disciple who could cast out evils and heal the sick." What she really means that belief in the Divine power has never made a disciple who could heal the sick; according to her, one must believe not in the power of the Almighty to heal us, but simply believe that there is nothing to be healed. And as no one from three centuries after the Crucifixion up to the time of "Science" believed this, of course there was no one who could heal the sick; and there is no need to look at any alleged facts. It is very convenient to have a theory which saves us such lots of needless trouble.

This delusion of hers that there is no such thing as body or matter, sickness or death is now again stated by her. And it goes, as previously, even into still more absurd statements. "The belief," she says, "that man has existence or mind separate from God is a dying error;" again the denial of Creation; again simple pantheism. "Sin, sickness, and death," she tells us, "had no terror for Jesus. Let men think they had killed the body! Afterward He would show it to them unchanged." In plain words, she means that His pretending to die was simply a trick. The Resurrection was an imposture; there never was anything of the kind. Christ did not, in fact, rise from the dead.

But St. Paul clearly tells us: "Now Christ is risen from the dead." "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." And He could not rise from the dead, except by first being dead; that is by the separation of His human Soul and Body.

It has seemed well on account of the fundamental importance of this article of the Christian Creed, its essential connection with Christianity, and the utter denial of Christianity involved in so-called "Christian Science," to give a somewhat extra emphasis to it.

Mrs. Eddy is not content, however, with this denial, but tries to make St. Paul a partner in it. "Paul writes," she tells, "for if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the (seeming) death of His Son," etc. It is, of course, only fair to remark that she puts "seeming" in parenthesis, as above; but it makes the quotation all the more impudent when she confesses that it is garbled. What is the use of quoting the Apostle at all, if you acknowledge that

he really teaches just the reverse of what you try to put into his mouth?

Then she tries to make out that because the disciples at first did not understand the Resurrection, they believed that it was only the ghost of their Lord which they had seen. "The reappearing of Jesus," she says, "was not the return of a spirit." Of course they did not think, except for a moment, that it was so. His own words, which she quotes—and apparently imagines that she was the first to understand them—convinced them that it was His own Body which they saw. "He presented," she informs us, "the same body that He had before the Crucifixion." No one who believes in the Resurrection doubts this; but no one, except Mrs. Eddy and those led astray by her, regards it as any proof that He had never died. The Christian faith of the Apostles, and which the whole Church has received from them, is simply that at the Crucifixion, Christ's Soul and Body were separated, for that is what death means; and that at the Resurrection, the union of them was restored.

She next goes on to "explain away" the Ascension as well, and without the slightest proof, or even shadow of reason, asserts that "it revealed unmistakably a probationary and progressive state beyond the grave." The impudence of this assertion exceeds anything that she has so far been guilty of.

But something still more astonishing occurs on the next page. This is simply phenomenal. Would anyone believe that one calling herself a Christian could write words like these? "The disciples' desertion of their Master in His last earthly struggle was punished: each one came to a violent death except St. John."

Is this not almost incredible? This thoroughly

worldly-minded deserter—for this is really just what she is—regards martyrdom, which universal Christian belief has always held to be our highest crown and glory, as a punishment! Indeed, the whole of mankind has always accorded to those who have died for their faith, even if it were erroneous, a certain amount of respect and admiration; but in the eyes of Mrs. Eddy, they were simply criminals. The duty of those who have been called on to die for their faith, was, according to her, simply to deny it, as she has done. The important thing, the "one thing necessary," in her gospel, is to secure the good things of this world, and let the next take care of itself. But He, whom she calls "the Master," tells us in all His gospels: "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it" (Matt. x. 39), and others to the same effect. We quote here from the Protestant version, as being remarkably emphatic, though substantially the same as our own.

But Mrs. Eddy's idea is that Christ's great benefit to us was to enable us to keep our bodily health; and, we may say, our comfort and general welfare in this world. As to sacrificing our life itself for Christ's sake, why such a thing could not be thought of by any genuine "student of Christian Science." There would be no "science" in anything like that.

She probably would consider the experience of St. John, in the caldron of boiling oil (of which she does not seem to have heard), and which naturally would have been a violent death, as showing that he, at least, was a genuine "Scientist." He must have said: "There is nothing in this boiling oil, it is merely a mortal error." By means of this "science" of his he escaped his "punishment." Of course he really was

not one of those who deserted the Master; so probably he did not have to be punished. But it must have been a disappointment to him not to receive the crown of martyrdom which had been given to the rest.

After a page of pious remarks, not quite so "scientific" as usual, she suddenly bursts out: "Where were the seventy whom Jesus sent forth? Were all conspirators save eleven?" She does not seem to have read in the Acts of the Apostles that immediately after the Ascension, when it came to the question of a successor to Judas, there were about a hundred and twenty disciples assembled in that upper room; probably this was about as many as it would conveniently hold. It may be reasonably and charitably supposed that if the seventy were not all there, they were at least well represented. Also, it does not seem that the seventy all lived in Jerusalem, or had all been told to assemble there. This we mention as an example of Mrs. Eddy's slap-dash style, somewhat unworthy, perhaps, of what she put forth, and her followers generally accept, as a sort of inspired document.

After a while, she comes back, of course, to "science" again. Speaking of our Divine Lord, she says: "His consummate example was for the salvation of us all, but only through doing the works which He did and taught others to do." That is to say, mainly His works to restore health; but also "to demonstrate His divine Principle." Not His Divinity, but His "divine Principle;" which, if the same as that of "Christian Science," was, presumably, that the notion of there being any real need to restore health was only a delusion of "mortal mind." And by "salvation" she seems to mean the curing us of the false idea that there is anything at all really the matter

with us. It is not quite clear how His "consummate example" helped toward this. To the unbiased observer, it would seem to indicate that there was a great deal the matter. But, of course, according to Mrs. Eddy, He did not really suffer at all; but it is hard to see why He should have pretended to do so. His example would demonstrate the "divine Principle" rather better, if He had smiled at the whole thing, or even joked at it.

She, however, accounts for this by saying, a little later, that "at the time Jesus felt our infirmities, He had not conquered all the beliefs of the flesh or His sense of material life, nor had He risen to His final demonstration of spiritual power." That is to say, that He, for the greater part of His life, had not soared to the heights of "Christian," or more properly "Eddian" Science, which she, professing to be His interpreter, subsequently attained. Why didn't she call it "Eddian Science" at once? Of course, it was to get the shelter and prestige of His Name for it. But she really does not seem to have doubted that she was altogether superior to Him. It is strange how so many, seemingly pious people, can swallow this blasphemy. It is simply because they have lost what is undoubtedly the Christian Faith, that Christ was, and is, really and truly the Incarnate God.

There is not much left in this chapter that requires special comment. Of course, there are any number of unmeaning sentences in it, but how can one comment on anything which really has no meaning or sense in it to comment on? The only definite idea in it is that there is nothing the matter with mankind except a want of bodily health, and that this is only apparent, and can easily be cured by simply denying

that there is any such want. If we are rightly atoned, according to Mrs. Eddy, that is to say, made one with God, there will be no difference between Him and ourselves. As He, in Himself, is pure Spirit, so shall we also be, and the matter in us (or with us) will disappear. Strangely enough, however, she herself insists that it remained in Our Lord, after His Resurrection, just the same in every way as it was before. The only disappearance of it, until His Ascension, was when it was, for a time, hid away in the grave. In Mrs. Eddy's own case, however, this has lasted a good while; and is to be feared, even by her own followers, that it would not, if examined, be found to be in very good condition. It has been quite carefully concealed. It is not even claimed that there has been any Ascension for it.

There is one thing, in a general way, about this chapter, which really ought to be mentioned. It professes to be about "Eucharist," as well as "Atonement." But about the former hardly anything seems to be said. One would think that the words of the institution of this great Sacrament would have some remarks made on them. What did Our Lord mean by saying "This is My Body;" "this is My Blood?" One would think that the usual non-Catholic explanation would at least be alluded to.

CHAPTER III.

Marriage.

It certainly does seem a little strange to lug in a chapter on "marriage" at such an early stage of the proceedings. One would expect something having a more immediate connection with Mrs. Eddy's "scien-

tific" plan of salvation. For even she herself does not seem to hold that marriage, theoretically, is an essential part of that plan, though making rather a point of it, practically, in her own case. On the whole, her practical ideas regarding it are such as are held by all good people; there is not much, if anything, really original about them. But there is one remark which she makes near the beginning which seems to require a little explanation. It is as follows: "Until the spiritual creation is discerned intact, is apprehended and understood, and His kingdom is come as in the vision of the Apocalypse—where the corporeal sense of creation was cast out, and its spiritual sense was revealed from heaven—marriage will continue, subject to such moral regulations as will secure increasing virtue."

The difficulty about this is that it does not plainly indicate when this discernment, apprehension and understanding occurred; or, if it has not yet occurred, when it is going to do so. We had supposed that the "corporeal sense of creation was cast out, and its spiritual sense was revealed from heaven," by Mrs. Eddy herself; and that the "casting out" and the "revelation" were quite accomplished for all Christian Scientists, as well as for Mrs. Eddy, personally. But it would appear that "scientists" are still allowed to marry, and do not forfeit their "science" by so doing. Perhaps, however, this corporeal sense is not to be entirely cast out, or the revelation to be fully made for anyone, until he or she dies, or—begging her pardon—*seems* to die. If that is her meaning, we all agree, there will be no marrying after that. We are glad to see that she accepts the words of Our Lord that "in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are

given in marriage" in this their usual sense. But then, you see, she does not say "*is* cast out," or "*is* revealed." The word is "was;" not *is*. There seems to be no way of getting things straight, or of putting any consistent sense into this passage.

We find a little farther on, another point to notice. "She that is married careth.....how she may please her husband," she quotes, correctly enough from the Bible; omitting, however, after "careth," the words, "for the things of the world." But in her own version—which we will use, not to be accused of corrupting the text, though both are substantially the same—we find: "The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit;" then the passage which Mrs. Eddy gives immediately follows with a "but" before it. All this context she omits. And all that she says about what she does quote is that "this is the pleasantest thing to do."

We had a sort of notion that the question would be, not what was the "pleasantest," but the best and most perfect; the most pleasant, not to ourselves, but to the Lord. St. Paul says of the man, two verses before, "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord." And the same would evidently be true of the woman. But this would not suit Mrs. Eddy's purpose. She ignores the whole sense of St. Paul's words, and would represent them as simply teaching us that "matrimony should never be entered into without a full recognition of its enduring obligation on both sides;" and that it is also much "pleasanter" to live in this way than to be constantly fighting and quarreling, and trying to get the best of everything for oneself.

A little beyond this, we find the following rather suspicious remark: "The nuptial vow should never be annulled, so long as its moral obligations are kept intact." There is really no meaning in this, except that it may be annulled, if its moral obligations are not kept intact. And as Mrs. Eddy has just said that one of these obligations is "the most tender solicitude for each other's happiness," it would seem that if this "tender solicitude" ceases, even on one side, or at any rate if it does so on both, the nuptial vow is quite annulled and knocked on the head. Or in other words, that "incompatibility" may be a quite sufficient cause for divorce.

She says that "the frequency of divorce shows that the sacredness of this relationship is losing its influence, and that fatal mistakes are undermining" the foundations of the nuptial vow. But really the fatal mistake is not in ceasing the "tender solicitude," but in thinking that the nuptial vow depends for its validity on it.

The only security for it on which she seems to depend is to be obtained by everyone becoming a "Scientist." "Separation never would take place," she says, "if both husband and wife were genuine Christian Scientists." Not, it would seem, that there is any law of God putting such separation out of the question, but simply that they wouldn't want to separate. "Science," she tells us, "inevitably lifts one's being higher in the scale of harmony and happiness." "Kindred tastes, motives and aspirations are necessary," she adds, "to the formation of a happy and permanent companionship. The beautiful in character is also the good, welding indissolubly the links of affection."

Still, perhaps, she may be willing to admit that kindred tastes, motives, and aspirations, and perhaps also beautiful characters, are occasionally found among people whom she would not regard as "scientific;" but they don't seem to be effectual in preventing divorce.

A good deal of platitude follows, in which the poor woman seems to imagine that "unscientific" people have no "craving" for anything but the pleasures of the senses. She says, as if it were quite an original idea with her, that the "good in human affections must have ascendancy over the evil, and the spiritual over the animal or happiness will never be won." As if anyone maintained the contrary, at any rate among any sort of Christian people!

But she goes on, more and more completely tangling herself up. "We must not," she says, "attribute more and more intelligence to matter, but less and less, if we would be wise and healthy." Who, except some non-Christian materialists, attributes any intelligence to matter at all? But it has its laws, which God has implanted in it, but could alter them at any time, or destroy matter itself at any moment which He may choose. But unless He chooses to alter or annul these laws, they are supreme in their own domain. Mrs. Eddy will never succeed, in matters pertaining entirely to that domain, in bringing about any change in them, unless the Almighty, to Whom alone they are completely subject, chooses to come especially to her assistance. She will never be able, by her "Christian Science" any more than others by their material science, to make an eclipse occur a second earlier or later than the law of gravitation requires; and she really knows this, and is

wise enough not to try to do so. It is only in matters in which the domains set by the Lord for matter and spirit, as it were overlap, as in those concerning the human body (to which she chooses to confine her attention) that she can, by her so-called "science," produce any effect whatever. But that this is possible is no new discovery of hers. Everyone knows that the soul of man has a very considerable control over the body; the way in which it has it is not thoroughly understood by us, and probably never will be. It can also direct the forces of mere matter into one channel or another, as we do continually by simply, for example, pressing a button; but its laws are not changed in the slightest degree. They work in precisely the same way, in this last case, if we press the button ourselves, or if some simple force of nature, by which something falls on the button, presses it for us.

It is not, of course, impossible, that this direction of the forces of nature may be accomplished by the soul without the help or intervention of the body; or by the voluntary action of some spirit not associated with a body; but even this would not require any change in the laws or the forces of nature, or any suspension of them, but only that some superior force should counteract them, and partly prevail against them, for the time being. This may be supposed, evidently, in the case of what may be called material miracles, recorded in the Bible or elsewhere. But this hardly applies to the alleged achievements of Mrs. Eddy or other "scientists," which mainly or even entirely relate to matters of bodily healing.

"Because mortals believe in material laws and reject the Science of Mind," she says, "this does not

make materiality first and the superior law of Soul last."

In point of fact, there are no mortals who believe in God as Omnipotent and believe in material laws as existing independently of Him. But all sensible mortals believe in God as the Author and Creator of matter as well as of mind; and think, in spite of Mrs. Eddy in her next sentence, that in the usual case, according to the laws which He has established for both matter and mind, "flannel is better for warding off pulmonary disease than the controlling Mind," that being the order divinely established. If, however, she means (by putting Mind with a capital M) the Mind of God, of course no Christian thinks anything of the sort. But the difficulty is that we know that this Mind is not in our control, and that it would be simply presumptuous for us to act as if it were.

In the next paragraph, we find something really mysterious. It is as follows: "In Science," Mrs. Eddy says, "man is the offspring of Spirit. The beautiful, good, and pure constitute his ancestry. His origin is not, like that of mortals, in brute instinct, nor does he pass through material conditions prior to reaching intelligence." Well, we still cling on, somehow, to the idea that man is a mortal, even according to Mrs. Eddy. What is the "mortal mind," that she speaks of, if not the mind of man? But perhaps she is speaking of Christian Scientists, or of those predestined to become so. But even they, even Mrs. Eddy herself, if we are not mistaken, passed through some material conditions prior to reaching intelligence, especially if she means the intelligence required for a "scientist." But if she just means plain, ordinary intelligence, it seems to follow that

scientists at any rate existed and had intelligence before they were born or even conceived. We did not know that such claims were made for them, or for anyone; and they do seem rather staggering. But we must confess to being rather mixed up, and have a lingering fear that Mrs. Eddy was also somewhat so, when she wrote these words.

But she goes on. "Spirit," she says, "is his (man's) primitive and ultimate source of being; God is his Father, and Life is the law of his being." Well, perhaps she only means that God created man, and that God is pure Spirit. This is orthodox enough. But it does not seem to be common sense to hold that God created man as also a pure spirit, and she doesn't actually hold it was. There was something, an error if you please, but still something else in him, even on her own reading, from the start. She cannot steadily keep up the pretense that there is not, or she would have to stop talking at all about "material conditions, flannel, real estate" or anything else.

There are a few more enigmatical sentences in this chapter, from which it is hard, and probably impossible, to extract any definite meaning. For instance, she tells us that "the time cometh of which Jesus spake, when He declared that in the resurrection there should be no more marrying or giving in marriage, but man would be as the angels." No doubt that the time for this cometh, but as we have said, it cannot well be supposed to be till after what is commonly called "death."

But, according to Mrs. Eddy, the time will be "when it is learned that God is the Father of all." We had the impression that this was learned a good

while ago. But of course she holds that no one but "scientists" have got hold of it yet. So she seems to mean that when everybody gets converted to her "science," marriage will stop, as it did with her when she became thoroughly scientific. But why should it not stop for all those who are truly disciples of hers? Surely there must be some such. Why should they have to wait till everyone comes into their ranks?

Well, she does seem really to hold that something of the kind is coming on in some sort of way which she does not fully explain. She says that she "discredits the belief that "agamogenesis" (or "parthenogenesis," as it is usually and more precisely called) "applies to the human species;" or in other words, that children cannot come by means simply of a woman. But still, she holds that "human generation" is going to cease.

"Proportionately," she says, "as human generation ceases, the unbroken links of eternal, harmonious being will be spiritually discerned; and man, not of the earth earthy but co-existent with God, will appear."

If this has any meaning at all, it is that a married couple will somehow or other have children "appear," simply because they are married; not, of course, unless they are. These children are going to be "evolved" from Spirit in some way. "The scientific fact," she says, "that man and the universe are evolved from Spirit, and so are spiritual, is as fixed in divine Science as is the proof that mortals gain the sense of health only as they lose the sense of sin and disease." She seems to think that the only alternative to children being "evolved" in this mysterious way, is that man is the creator of them.

"Mortals," she says, "can never understand God's creation while believing that man is a creator." We have never met anyone who believed this. Certainly no Christian has any such idea. Catholics, at any rate, believe that every individual human soul is a new creation of God; created by Him, not "evolved" from Him. The corresponding body they believe to be formed from the bodies of the parents according to the laws which God has established. The matter out of which it is formed was created by Him in the beginning.

But, somehow or other, according to Mrs. Eddy, "the real, ideal man appears"—she perhaps means "will appear"—"as the false and material disappears." "God's children already created will be cognized," she says, just before this, "only as man finds the truth of being." (What is it, by the way, to be cognized?) The only possible meaning of this seems to be that God's children will only be known as such when man finds out that He is their Father and Creator; but that was found out ages ago. And the sentence is tautological, anyway.

Next follows a real gem of unmeaning nonsense.

"No longer to marry nor to be 'given in marriage' neither closes man's continuity nor his sense of increasing number in God's infinite plan." What is meant, precisely, by "continuity?" And what is man's "sense of increasing number?" Of course it can't be an actually increasing number, for if so, why say "sense" of it? The fact simply is, that there is no sense in the whole thing, and we are merely wasting time over it.

One more brief remark, and we are done with this chapter. "Some day," Mrs. Eddy asks in conclud-

ing it, "the child will ask his parent: 'Do you keep the First Commandment? Do you have one God and creator, or is man a creator?' If the father replies, 'God creates man through man,' the child may ask, 'Do you teach that Spirit creates materially or do you declare that Spirit is infinite, therefore matter is out of the question?'"

She evidently holds to her idea that God cannot create anything differing in any way from Himself. Or, in other words, that He cannot create (out of nothing, or that is what creation means) anything at all. Her old pantheism again.

Then, triumphantly, she quotes Our Lord's words again: "The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage" (Luke xx. 34, 35). She seems to think that this is a sort of clincher. But in point of fact, its actual and obvious meaning relates, as we have said, to the world to come, after the day of our physical resurrection.

It might have been well for Mrs. Eddy to remember the words of St. Paul, in his second epistle to Timothy (ii. 17) referring to Hymeneus and Philetus; "who," he says, "have erred from the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already, and have subverted the faith of some." Perhaps they discovered "Christian Science" before Mrs. Eddy herself.

Swedenborg, also, had an idea similar to hers, about the resurrection. But it did not occur to him to get a cure for disease connected with it, so that it has not been so much of a success as hers.

CHAPTER IV.

Christian Science and Spiritualism.

As this chapter opens, poor Mrs. Eddy becomes more wild and paradoxical than ever. "The revelations of Christian Science," she tells us, "unlock the treasures of Truth." Well, here are some "gems" out of these treasures. "There is," we learn, "but one Spirit." This, of course, is just her old pantheism again. "Man," she next proceeds to say, "is never God, but spiritual man, made in God's likeness, reflects God." Well then, is man a spirit, or is he not? If not, what does she mean by "spiritual" man? She tries to get out of her old pantheism, and pull the wool out of her eyes, and out of those of her readers, by saying that "spiritual man reflects" God. But if any reflecting is to be done, there must be something to do the reflecting; and it must be either spirit or something else. But she says that there is but one Spirit; that of God, of course. Spiritual man, then, is something else, not spirit. But if not spirit, he must, it would seem, be corporeal. But if so, his reflections, whatever they may be, according to her, give no information about God, or about anything whatever. For she says that "the testimony of the corporeal senses cannot inform us what is real, and what is delusive." And sense, according to her, is all that there is in the "corporeal." This, however, is plainly impossible. "Sense" cannot exist at all by itself; there must be something in which it is to reside.

The plain truth is that there is no making any sense out of anything that Mrs. Eddy says, when she

gets on this line. It is quite true that nothing exists *of necessity* outside of God; but her whole trouble, and her unavoidable absurdities, come from her failure to recognize that God can create, out of nothing, what has, previously, no existence; that, in fact, this is just what "creation" means. When once created, however, it is truly real unless God chooses to reduce it to nothing again. She often talks about creation; but she really has no idea what the word means. When she tries to get rid of both pantheism and creation, she simply has to flounder around.

Let us see just one more specimen of this floundering. She says that we can close our eyes, and imagine the touching or smelling of a flower. "Thus," she says, "you learn that the flower is a product of mind, a formation of thought rather than of matter." In fact, we don't learn anything of the kind; most people easily distinguished between the real flower and the thought or dream of it. Then she says that we may dream about landscapes, or men and women, as well as about flowers. "Thus," she says, "you learn that these also"—the men and women, apparently, as well as the flower—"are images, which mortal mind holds and evolves, and which simulate mind, life, and intelligence." But what about the mortal mind itself? It must exist in order to evolve anything.

Now, to get out of this nonsense, as far as possible, and to get at what she tries to say about spiritualism, or "spiritism," as it is more correctly, to avoid confusion, called. She says that its "basis and structure are alike material and physical. Its spirits are so many corporealities." Not necessarily. It is true that modern experiments have seemed to some people

to indicate the existence of "astral bodies," so called, in connection with them. But it is perfectly possible for one to be a spiritist, without believing in these. Spiritism does not, necessarily, "presuppose Spirit to be a corporeal being."

And this is not, really, Mrs. Eddy's objection to spiritism. It is, in her own words, that it has "no scientific basis nor origin, no proof nor power outside of human testimony. It is the offspring of the physical senses. There is no sensuality in Spirit." And then she adds, as a kind of clincher, "I never could believe in spiritualism." That, of course, ought to be conclusive. Her infallibility, of course, is beyond anything that was ever claimed for the Pope, or even for the prophets. Theirs was only occasional; but hers lasts all the time. Why should she, or anyone else, try to argue, when it is so easy to settle everything?

But it seems, after all, that she does condescend to do so, and that we may be allowed to examine her statements. She states that spiritism "has no scientific basis nor origin, no proof nor power outside of human testimony." We had an idea that the basis and origin of all that is scientific, outside of what is metaphysical or mathematical, rested largely on human testimony. She indeed bases her "Christian Science" more successfully than in any other way, on her own testimony and that of others, to the cures effected by it. In the next paragraph to those already quoted, she continues to knock out, not only her own "science," but the source from which she claims to derive it.

"There is," she says, "but one spiritual existence, the Life of which corporeal sense can take no

cognizance." In this she widely differs, certainly, from St. John, who begins his first epistle thus: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked on, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life: for the life was manifested; and we have seen and do bear witness, and declare unto you the life eternal, which was with the Father, and hath appeared to us."

Of course, Mrs. Eddy has shown often enough that she does not believe in the Divinity of Christ. But in this paragraph she goes farther, and does not admit that His Body, was, even after the Resurrection, "permeated by Spirit." If it had been, she says, it would "disappear to mortal sense." But all that she claims to derive from Him came before any such disappearance, that is to say, before His Ascension. And it really also would seem, to most of us, that she rather knocks the ground from under *her own* feet when she says that a "sinning earthly mortal" is not "the medium through which truth passes to the earth."

Practically, she denies, in these last words, that truth can ever pass to us on earth at all. For even if she does not count Our Lord as a "sinning, earthly mortal" (and it is certainly to be hoped that she does not), she has to admit that such were some of the media through which His words have passed to us. But perhaps she would deny that truth passed to us at all by His words. Why, then, does she quote them? Or, why, indeed, did she herself write a book about "Christian Science," even if she herself was not a sinning, earthly mortal? For her book must have been set up, printed, and sold by some such peo-

ple; and that would take all the good out of it as a means for us to get at the truth.

She now goes on to some other statements, which seem to refer to what she considers "spiritualism" to be. She says that "the belief that material bodies return to dust, hereafter to rise up as spiritual bodies with material sensations and desires, is incorrect." Strange to say, we find among the few verses of Scripture, which her "Key" seems to fit—at any rate she does not give many more—these words of God to Adam (Gen. iii. 19): "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." If this part of the belief of which she speaks is incorrect, it is rather strange, for this she gives out as being the word of God. But perhaps she only means that the part about "rising up" is wrong. But at whom is she driving in that part? Who holds that the spiritual bodies which rise up have "material sensations and desires?" It would rather seem that she is "fighting a man of straw."

Again, she says, "it is a grave mistake to suppose that matter is any part of the reality of intelligent existence." Few, if any, believe that matter is in itself intelligent; but it can hardly be doubted that it plays a great part, and is a great help, in intelligent existence. Not even Mrs. Eddy herself could have got along very well without it.

But really it is quite plain that either with it, or without it, she confesses that she cannot rise high enough in intelligent existence to be of any service for the work which she has undertaken. "The finite," she says, "cannot become the channel of the infinite." Well now, is Mrs. Eddy finite or is she infinite? We think that she herself must admit that

she is only finite. But she claims to be the means, or channel, by which a Divine Science has been made known to the rest of us. It follows, according to her statements, that this claim must be rejected; and she must confess that—to use her own words—"it is a grave mistake to suppose" that her "Christian Science" is Divine at all.

In her anxiety to destroy the tree of "material existence," she cuts off the branch on which she herself is sitting. She repeats her own condemnation in the very next paragraph. "To be on communicable terms with Spirit," she tells us, "persons must be free from organic bodies." But when she wrote this, she was not as yet quite free from this "error." And she repeatedly insists that "Spirit" simply means "God." She not only was unfit, then, at that time, to receive a revelation from God; she was not even on communicable—or speaking—terms with Him. But this, as it seems to us, was going rather too far.

She goes on insisting that "spiritualism would transfer men from the spiritual sense of existence back into its material sense." What ground she may have for this statement is not quite clear; it is not, at any rate, the usual idea of spiritualism. But she seems to identify it, on some special information of her own, with materialism; and says: "This gross materialism is scientifically impossible, since to infinite Spirit there can be no matter." It is, of course, usually believed that to "infinite Spirit"—to God, that is to say—the creation of anything whatever ought to be possible; but as has been remarked, Mrs. Eddy does not seem to quite understand what is meant by "creation." To her, as appears, from her "Key" at the very outset, it is simply the "unfolding of

spiritual ideas;" what is meant by "unfolding" them is not clear. But the production of anything not previously existing she evidently regards as impossible, even to God Himself; and she naturally falls into pantheism, which is her real trouble, and causes her perpetual confusion, as she tries to escape from it. If she would only squarely adopt it, she would get along much better with her other false notions.

She almost does so, a little later on in this chapter. "Existence," she says, "continues to be a belief of corporeal sense until the Science of being is reached." Poor woman! She is struggling, without any really scientific preparation, with these grave problems which require the most serious study, even by the greatest theologians. She seems never to have heard of their investigations of these mysteries, humbly made by the help of the light which the Holy Ghost, through the Church, sheds on them.

Of course her difficulties are as much with the existence of other spirits, as well as with that of matter. But she tries to shake these off, by ignoring in spiritism, as well as in orthodox Christian teaching, any assertion of the existence of spiritual beings except that of God Himself, and making out that in them also is "materialism," from which we are gradually being freed. But the question who are *we*, she puts aside, and will not grapple with it. Neither spiritual nor material it would seem.

In spite of her efforts, her pantheism crops out now and then continually. "Man," she says, "in the likeness of God as revealed in Science cannot help being immortal." That is to say, his existence is not contingent, but necessary; and must go on eternally. But she seems to fail to see that this would

show that the existence of man, as well as that of God, had no beginning, as well as no end. But this would be a too logical pantheism for her to swallow, or to give out at any rate. But she likes to serve it up under a fine-sounding form of words, such as this: "In Science, man's immortality depends on that of God, good, and follows as a necessary consequence of the immortality of good."

Just after this passage, she makes the following statement: "That somebody, somewhere, must have known the deceased person, supposed to be the communicator, is evident." How does she make this out? And what does she mean by "known?" In ordinary language it would seem to mean been acquainted in this world with the person now deceased; or, perhaps, have been properly introduced to him. Well, the chances certainly are that somebody, somewhere, had even that privilege. But why should it be necessary? We do not, usually, stand on ceremony so strictly. Most of us do not refuse to communicate by telephone, for instance, with people to whom we have never been introduced, or with whom we have had no previous acquaintance; and we may even go so far as to give the time of day to some stranger on the street. And one does not exactly see the connection between this remark, even if there is any sense in it, and the one which follows, which informs us that "it is as easy to read distant thoughts as present." We might form a connection between the two remarks by means of the next, in which we are told that "we think of an absent *friend* as easily as we do of one present." But this won't do, because she immediately extends this to the "absent mind" in general. "Chaucer," she says, "wrote centuries

ago, and yet we still read his thought in his verse;" and even Mrs. Eddy can't have been personally known to Chaucer. We must confess that we can't see what she is driving at; and we have a lingering suspicion that she doesn't see it herself.

And so she goes on through a whole page, of which the gist, if there is any, seems to be that "even if our departed friends were near us, we could not communicate with them, because "their state of consciousness must be different from ours." It certainly does not seem evident that it must be so different as all that. Her proof of it appears to be established in her own mind by the question which she asks: "When wandering in Australia, do we look for help to the Esquimaux in their snow huts?" Really, however, the trouble with the Esquimaux in this case is not a want of anything in their "state of consciousness," but that they are, physically, so far away, and also probably don't know anything about Australia. But if an Esquimaux had ever been in Australia, as the departed friends are supposed to have been here, he might perhaps be of some service. And at any rate if we could reach him by 'phone, he could tell us something about Esquimaux-land; and in the case of the departed spirits, it is about their world that we want to know, not about our own. On the whole, the illustration does not seem to be a very fortunate one.

We have dwelt somewhat at length on this—in itself rather unimportant point—for it seems to be about the only one which has any close reference to "Spiritualism," which, rather than Spirit in general, seems to be the special subject of the chapter.

But Mrs. Eddy gives a caution, immediately fol-

lowing it, which is certainly well worthy of our attention, and also would have deserved her own. "It is wise," she says, "earnestly to consider whether it is the human mind or the Divine Mind which is influencing one." It is refreshing to learn, by the way, that there really is such a thing as the human mind. Usually it would appear that this mind is only an "error," and has no real (or positive) existence. Mrs. Eddy seems, however, just here, to be willing to look at things as they actually are. And it is just this "consideration" which she recommends, which brings us to the real and serious danger of spiritism. She wants us, it would seem, to realize that there is no possibility of our coming under influences which are real, but very far from being Divine. And the worst of it is—though this she hardly admits—that these influences may be a great deal more injurious to us than merely human ones can be.

The existence of such influences is plainly shown to us in the comparatively small portion of Scripture to which Mrs. Eddy confines the use of her "Key." But she chooses to shut her eyes to it; to explain it all away. And in this she simply falls in with the prevailing ideas of the world in this unbelieving age.

"The masterpiece of Satan," said the great Jesuit preacher, Father de Ravignan, "has been to get his existence denied by the world of to-day." People who do not believe in him will not be on their guard against him. But if there is anything plainly taught in Scripture—and there are many things so taught, though it nowhere claims to be our only guide to truth in religion—it is the actual existence of Satan and other evil spirits. We have Our Lord's own word for it. We read in St. Luke's Gospel that He

said in replying to His disciples, who told Him that "the devils are subject to us in Thy Name," that He Himself "saw Satan like lightning falling from heaven." Of course, Mrs. Eddy can explain away these plain words, as she does so many other things which He said. But the personal existence of Satan and his crew is asserted most clearly, over and over again, in Scripture, particularly in the New Testament. And it is also confessed by modern spiritists, and even by the "controls" themselves. "I am not a departed spirit," said one of them not long ago, to its medium, as reported by a scientific investigator, in the *Annals of Psychical Science*. Usually, as the endeavor of most spiritists is to prove the "survival of bodily death," and evidence of it is specially acceptable to them, "controls" do not speak so plainly.

But at any rate, whether we are ready to accept such statements or not, the possibility of diabolic influences in any sort of communications can hardly be denied, except by those who, like Mrs. Eddy, find the actual existence of anything not Divine, inconsistent with a theory to which they have committed themselves, and which they choose to regard as unquestionable. And this, as was above remarked, is the real danger of the whole business to people in general, and even to "scientists" (or Eddyists) themselves, that it requires the most serious consideration, and even with such consideration it will not always be ascertained what sort of "mind" it is by which we are "influenced," as Mrs. Eddy herself warns us. And she does not indicate any way, in which her own statements can be clearly determined as coming from the Divine Mind, as long as she admits that they may come from some other "mind,"

even though it be so exalted a one as hers. Of course, if her mind is actually identical with the Divine Mind, and has no admixture of human "error" in it, we need not be worried; but in that case we fail to see any need for the consideration which she recommends. It would be quite sufficient that the "influence" is that of Mrs. Eddy. If it is "Eddy," it is all right; if it is "not Eddy," it is wrong. Where, then, is the need for any great care or earnestness in consideration? There remains, however, one little difficulty, it must be confessed; it is, that Mrs. Eddy not infrequently contradicts herself.

The rest of the chapter has nothing particular about "Spiritualism," which it is fair to assume, she means in it, what is more distinctively defined by the word "spiritism." For she says that she "never could believe in spiritualism." It evidently is the ordinary thing known as such, which she means. Or at any rate, it probably is so; for really, one is not always sure—in fact, one seldom is—just what she is talking about.

One curious idea, however, crops out in the last part of this chapter, rather more frequently than usual. It is that the belief of ordinary Christians, and people in general who are not "scientists," is that thought and all mental action are produced by what we call "matter." This is not, perhaps, distinctly stated, but she seems to be fighting this "straw man" all the time. She seems to think that because we believe in the reality of matter, we must be "materialists."

Of course, one can find specimens, all the way through this chapter as well as others, of the sort of thing already commented on. For example: "The more destructive matter becomes, the more its nothingness will appear" (how, we might inquire, can "noth-

ing" be destructive, or become so?) "until matter reaches its mortal zenith" (how can nothing reach a zenith?) "in illusion and forever disappears." If people like this sort of talk, that, as Lincoln said, is the sort of thing they like, and which fills them with admiration for Mrs. Eddy's wonderful wisdom. But it might be well for them to ask themselves if they can translate it into plain English, or make any real sense out of it.

There is, however, one fairly definite statement of hers which really ought to be noticed, as she makes it with some reference to her special hobby about bodily "healing," which she regards as the chief object which Christ came to earth to accomplish. She says: "If this Science [Christian Science] has been thoroughly learned and properly digested, we can learn the truth [all truth of course, for why one more than another?] more accurately than the astronomer can read the stars or calculate an eclipse." Well, if this statement is correct, Mrs. Eddy ought to have shown its correctness by calculating eclipses "more accurately" than they are given in the Nautical Almanac. For she must have "learned and properly digested" her Christian Science as well as anyone can be expected to do it. But if she had made any attempt in this line, it would hardly have been successful, unless she had looked in the Almanac on the sly; and even if she had, she probably would not have correctly understood the calculations there made, and therefore prudently did not make the attempt.

Later on, she makes the remark that "the earth's motion and position are sustained by Mind alone." This is a very true one; but all the "Christian Science" that Mrs. Eddy or anyone else has ever at-

tained, has never obtained any approximation to that Mind except by the help of plain ordinary "material" science; which, according to her, could lead to nothing but "error." Perhaps, however, she would say that the observations made on phenomena like eclipses, and even the phenomena themselves, are also "errors;" but it is strange that two independent errors can agree so well. If Mrs. Eddy here, and indeed all through, had tried to use a little more common sense, she would have avoided a good many blunders.

But we must pass on to other chapters, in which we shall also find them, perhaps even more abundantly.

CHAPTER V.

Animal Magnetism.

This is rather an antiquated sort of title; but as she is careful to state, she uses the term as meaning what is now usually known as "hypnotism." But still she takes advantage of the old form to show, to her own satisfaction, that God can have nothing to do with it, for what seems to her the conclusive reason that "His power is neither animal nor human." "God," according to her, "governs all that is real, harmonious, and eternal," and seems to mean by this that He governs nothing else; probably because she holds that there is nothing else. This "argument" would be shorter and simpler if she had said: "There can't be any animal magnetism, because there isn't any animal." So of course, as she continues, "animal magnetism, mesmerism, or hypnotism, is a mere negation, possessing neither intelligence, power, nor reality." She naturally goes on to demonstrate that therefore it can't do any harm. An extract which

she gives from the Boston *Herald* objects to "mesmerism" as implying the use of despotic control, and quite sensibly states that it may "be abused by its possessor." "Oh, no," says Mrs. Eddy. "Mankind must learn that evil is not power. Its so-called despotism is but a phase of nothingness."

Very well then; this is really quite consoling. If an evil-minded person—she seems to admit sometimes that there are evil-minded (or mortal-minded) people—should fire off a train of powder or other explosive, it really would seem that even Christian Science practitioners who were in the vicinity might get hurt; that it might, indeed, in one sense, be a phase of nothingness for their arms or legs, or even their whole bodies; but one which would seriously interfere with their usefulness. Perhaps, however, she does not believe this would be the case, if they really had "digested" the principles of Christian Science. For she says that "Christian Science despoils the kingdom of evil." But we fear that even she herself would not have liked to take such a chance. And besides it seems to be some sort of evil to blow up people who are not "scientific" enough to escape unharmed.

She says that, "in Christian Science, man can do no harm." But we see that here by "man" she only means Scientists. And why? Simply because such an one can't think wrong. "Scientific thoughts," she says, "are true thoughts, passing from God to man." With this, the sky seems to clear up somewhat. There is some sense in holding that no harm can be done to Scientists, or by Scientists. But her other dicta will have to be modified. To the assertion that "evil is not power," we shall have to add "over Scientists."

Really, however, her idea and statement was that it is not power at all, over anyone or anything. For "evil," she tells us a little above, "is unreal." And this is her doctrine all the time. What is "unreal" certainly has no power. In that we all agree.

It is, however, a hopeless undertaking to make any sense of statements like the following: "Christian Science goes to the bottom of mental action, and reveals the theodicy which indicates the rightness of all divine action as the emanation of divine Mind, and the consequent wrongness of the opposite so-called action—evil, occultism, necromancy, mesmerism, animal magnetism, hypnotism." This is not a statement of any thing at all. It is a mere string of words.

There is quite a good deal of this kind of talk in the chapter, but not so much as in most of them, for the simple reason that it is shorter than the others. So, for the same reason, there is no reason to say so much about it; but we can pass on to the next, which has an appearance of coming nearer to the gist of what Mrs. Eddy regards as the gospel which Christ came to teach; that is to say, how to escape from bodily disease, and the suffering that it causes. St. Paul and the other Apostles, and all the saints, regarded the sharing or "fellowship of His sufferings and being made conformable to His death" (Phil. iii. 10) as the greatest blessing which, in this life, they could hope to attain; but Mrs. Eddy's notion is evidently quite different. He, however, tells us, and takes the pains to repeat it, that "though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" (Gal. i. 8). Mrs. Eddy's own version is even more emphatic than ours.

CHAPTER VI.

Science, Theology, Medicine.

Mrs. Eddy prefixes to this chapter a quotation from St. Paul, which she seems to mean to apply to herself. St. Paul, in it, tells us of his gospel, that he "neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." And she starts out by informing that "in the year 1866, I discovered the Christ Science or divine laws of Life, Truth, and Love, and named my discovery Christian Science." And that there may be no doubt what kind of a "discovery" this was, she goes on to say that "God had been graciously filling me during many years for the reception of this final revelation of the absolute divine Principle of scientific mental healing." It was, then, not what is commonly understood as a "scientific" discovery, but a real and genuine *revelation;* just the thing that St. Paul warns us against.

Christians in general, and Catholics in particular, have always, in accordance with St. Paul's words, refused to accept any revelation of later date than that made to the Apostles. It may be worth while to state, by the way, that Catholics are far from imagining that even the Pope, though divinely commissioned as successor to the Apostles, has the power which they had, to receive or promulgate new revelation. The sphere of his infallibility is simply to determine, in case of doubt, what they had received from Christ or from the Holy Ghost. But Mrs. Eddy's claim, as you see, goes far beyond that. The Pope, moreover, in thus determining, simply tries, by a careful study of Scripture and tradition, to find out, historically, what

the actual doctrine was in the Church of the Apostles itself; but Mrs. Eddy does not bother about that. She is quite as competent to get original revelations as the Apostles themselves.

This, of itself, should completely discredit her "Christian Science" in the eyes of Catholics, and should suffice for all genuine Christians. For the latter, in general, it ought to be enough to remark that there is in Scripture no intimation of anyone to come with authority to communicate a new message from God, after that made by Christ and His chosen Apostles. Mrs. Eddy is condemned by her own pretensions just as much and on the same grounds as Mahomet, and is just as thoroughly antichristian as he was. The only way in which Scripture predicts her is in passages like Matt. xxiv. 5: "Many will come in My name, saying I am Christ: and they will seduce many." It would have been well for Mrs. Eddy to have thought more seriously of these and other similar words. And particularly for Catholics, it would also be well to add those very "intolerant" ones of St. John's first Epistle: "We are of God. He that knoweth God, heareth us. He that is not of God, heareth us not. By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error."

But it is time to go on, and look into what Mrs. Eddy's pretensions actually are, and to see not only how antichristian they are, and how fallacious in themselves. She starts out, as usual, to fight a notion of her own, which is not a Christian one at all. "Feeling," she says, "so perpetually the false consciousness that life inheres in the body; yet remembering that in reality God is our Life." Now all good Christians are as much persuaded of this falsity and of this reality

as Mrs. Eddy herself. Life does not "inhere" in the body, we all know that; that is to say, it is not "stuck" in it, for that is what "inhering" would mean. Christians, as has already been said, are not materialists. And we all perfectly recognize that "in reality God is our Life;" and not only our Life, but the Life of all that is; that all life originates in Him, is created by Him, and requires His continual support for it to continue. There is not, for even a moment, any life independent of His. But it does not follow from this that all life is identical with His, any more than that inanimate creation is identified with Him.

It is really time now for us to come to some understanding of what is meant by the word "life," instead of using it vaguely, as Mrs. Eddy so constantly does. Life, properly speaking, does not simply mean existence. Inanimate matter (such as stones, metals, chemical substances in general) has a real existence. But it is not said to have life in any sense if it is merely governed by the physical—in a technical sense —or chemical laws which entirely control what is recognized as inanimate. There is something more in it than these and which *directs* them; though we do not, as yet, exactly know what it is. Whatever it is, it is, of course, dependent on the will of God, created and maintained by Him, as inanimate matter itself is.

It is interesting to all of us, particularly to students of natural science. But it is not important, as far as Mrs. Eddy's doctrines are concerned. For they are really occupied, almost or quite exclusively, with human life; hardly with that of vegetables, or of brutes, at all. Whatever may be held with regard to brute or vegetable life, man is distinguished from the inanimate

by having something connected with his material body, which is quite different from that body, and which has none of the ordinary marks or properties rightly belonging to matter. It is not directly apprehended by any of the senses, by means of which we know all that we are able, experimentally, to know about matter. It has none of the properties we find by our senses to exist in matter. It has no extension, color, odor or taste. It is invisible and intangible. But it is, though not apprehended directly by the senses, much more intelligible to us than what is so apprehended. It is, in fact (in philosophy) called the *intelligible,* as distinguished from the *sensible.* We may, if we please, and sometimes we do, doubt the information which the senses gives us about matter; but we cannot refuse to believe in the existence of this; for it is by it that the refusal would have to be made.

It is not exclusively located in, or confined to any part of our material bodies, though it operates more effectually in some than in others. Its activities are more or less helped or hindered by the good or bad condition of the body, as is quite evident; that the body can operate on it is true. But it is also true, and much more evidently, that it can and does act on the body.

This principle of activity in us is, by the universal consent of all Christians, of immensely more importance than any residing in the body. And by the same universal consent, the body is not necessary to its existence; but it and its mysterious union with the body are necessary to the existence of the body as an organized substance. If this union ceases, the body becomes mere matter, subject to the same physical laws as matter in general. But the action of this principle

in us is not, in itself, affected; but only as regards its connection with the material world outside. This principle in us is called the *spirit,* or *soul.*

Human life, as known in this material world, involves the existence of the soul and also of the body with which it is connected. Each, however, may be said to have a life of its own. But the life of the body is evidently connected with that of the soul, and ceases when the connection is entirely broken by the change which we call death. According to universal Christian belief, that of the soul continues after death. The life, both of the soul and of the body, comes, of course, from God. But neither of them is identified with His. These simple facts every Christian believes, and such has always been the teaching of the Christian Church.

But it appears that Mrs. Eddy, in some way, got the idea that the Church, at any rate at the present day, had accepted, if it had not held from the beginning, thoroughly materialistic views on these subjects, and believed that matter existed quite independently of God, and that all its properties "inhered" in it without being caused in any way by Him. She seems to have thought that according to Christian teaching, "life inheres," as she says, "in the body" of itself and by itself; that it is a purely physical "function," as a mathematician would say, of the energies which the body possesses of itself; but that these energies may cease to produce it, by being, as it were, exhausted, or in some way which she does not explain. And that this is not the case (which every Christian understands very well) she calls a "heavenly conviction," which came to her by a special revelation; that it was, in her case, "the gift of the grace of God, given

unto me by the effectual working of His power." In point of fact there was no need of any special revelation to her, unless she was so stupid as not to possess the faculties of reason, by which it is quite possible for people in general to see that there can be only one necessary and self-existent Being, and that all the energies existing in any other come from His creating and preserving power.

"It was," she tells us, "the divine law of Life and Love, unfolding to me the demonstrable fact that matter possesses neither sensation nor life." It certainly is a demonstrable fact, that matter, *in itself*, independent of God, does not and cannot possess either sensation or life, and indeed that it cannot without Him exist in any way. But that this (if this is what she means) was unfolded in any special way to her, implies that she herself could not get at it otherwise. But she says herself, that it is "demonstrable." Was she, then, the only person so inaccessible to demonstration, that she had to have it "unfolded" to her by a special revelation? But to be fair to her, this cannot be what she means. Well, then, what does she mean? She means that matter cannot, even by any power from God, either have sensation or life. There is no other thing for her to mean; and she might as well say right out, that matter cannot, or at any rate, does not exist in any way. For she says that "human experiences show the falsity of all material things." And what is the meaning of this, if not that there are no material things?

The whole difficulty with the poor woman is that she never has accepted, or apparently even understood, the dogma of creation, as has already been remarked. She cannot or will not admit that anything can exist unless

it always has existed. It is a puzzle, undoubtedly, to all of us, how something can be created out of nothing. But the rest of us, as a rule, see that, as a fact, it is unquestionable.

Conformably with this conclusion of hers, that there are no material things, she arrives at another, namely, that the only sufferer is "mortal mind," whatever that may be. But what is this "mortal mind?" If there are no material things, how can there be any spiritual or mental things? It is just as demonstrable of mind outside of the Divine Mind, as it is of matter, that it cannot exist of itself.

What seems to result from all this simply is that there really is, according to Mrs. Eddy, something which God somehow did manage to create, and which really exists as a fact; and it is what she calls "mortal mind." It really exists, however delusive its imaginings about matter and even about itself may be. But we read on a little farther, and this hope of something to stand on is knocked out, by the statement that "Christian Science reveals incontrovertibly that Mind" (with a large M) "is All-in-all, and that the only realities are the divine Mind and idea."

This she calls a "great fact." She confesses that it is not "seen to be supported by sensible evidence." What she means by "sensible evidence" is not perfectly clear. She can't mean the evidence of the bodily senses, for that, of course, with her, could not exist. There is no material body, she tells us, and of course no bodily senses. Probably she means rational evidence. For, she says, its "divine Principle is demonstrated" (that is, proved rationally) "by healing the sick and thus proved absolute and divine." But unfortunately there really are no "sick." The only

realities, she has just stated, "are the divine Mind and idea."

Certainly, Mrs. Eddy's book is a very holy one. Wherever you put your finger, you find a hole. Such is the result of neglecting the senses as an evidence of certitude. When you need them most, they slip away from you, and you have nothing; only vacancy.

She goes on, struggling desperately for some firm footing. "I knew," she says, "the principle of all harmonious Mind action to be God." "The principle of all harmonious Mind action." What is meant by this exactly? A paragraph or so above, "Mind is all." Now Mind (with a large M) which in her notation means God, is reduced to being merely the principle of all harmonious Mind action. But if Mind still means God, it is certainly a very small claim that He is the principle of His own action. Perhaps she meant to write mind (with a small m). But if Mind (with a large M) is All, there is no room for mind, even with a small m; which, nevertheless, she told us just now that she had discovered as producing "all the organism and action of the mortal body." She says that, in this producing, it is misnamed *mind*. What, then, is the right name for it? "Mortal mind," she prefers to call it. But in the ordinary use of language, mortal mind should mean *some* kind of mind, unless perhaps it is quite a new word, mortalmind; just one word, not two. This, however, does not help. If Mind is All-in-all, and matter is naught, mortalmind is also naught, just as absolutely naught as matter is. What is the use of having a name, when there is nothing to be named?

Oh, the whole thing is simply a maze of hopeless confusion. And yet in struggling with it, Mrs. Eddy

says that she was "buoyant with hope." She hoped, it would seem, that in course of time some sense could be made of it, by somebody else, if not by herself. Certainly she must have had a very sanguine disposition. No sense can be got out of it, for the simple reason that there is no sense in it. And no sense can be made of it, because there is nothing to be made sense of.

She seems to base her hope, sometimes, on using big or somewhat unusual words; such as the "equipollence" of God, which appears a little below. We find "equipollence" defined in the dictionary as follows:

1. Equality of power, force, signification, or application.

2. And equivalence between two or more propositions.

In relation to God, it does not appear what meaning Mrs. Eddy attaches to the word. There seems to be none, except perhaps that she uses the word "Mind" as synonymous with "God." This is quite allowable, but requires, of course, more complete statement. But it is not evident how by it "Man's perfectibility and the establishment of the kingdom of heaven on earth" is "brought to light," which she asserts to be the case.

She says that "in following these leadings of scientific revelation, the Bible was my only textbook." It really seems that it might have been more prudent for her to take some commentary made by those more learned than herself; for St. Peter tells us that in the epistles of St. Paul "there are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest unto their own destruction;" and says that the same is true also of the other Scriptures. (This is Mrs.

Eddy's own version.) But of course when they were "illumined" for her from on High, the wonder is only that she troubled herself with the Bible at all; and, in fact, it does not seem that she used her "textbook" very much. Usually, she got along without any textbook at all. Her idea of Christ's teachings is obtained rather from what He ought to have taught, than from what He actually, according to the records, did teach. Any statement which He made, but which is not thoroughly "scientific," can be easily explained by His imperfect scientific development. One has only to look at her book to see how seldom in it she quotes the Bible at all. But it is strange that, as she did not have to make her gospel agree with it, she could not get up something agreeing with itself a little better.

She says about this very book of hers, that "no human pen nor tongue taught me the Science contained in this book *Science and Health;* and neither tongue nor pen can overthrow it." Well, if that is the case, it is not very surprising: it is rather hard to "overthrow" or even oppose a statement which has no ascertainable meaning in it to be opposed. It is, of course, impossible to make any remark on all the wild statements of which this book is full without writing one a hundred times as large. All that can be done is to make a selection, here and there, of some which may serve as examples. It is, fortunately, not necessary to notice them all, for the great majority of them are simply repetitions; now and then something may emerge which seems to be a little different from the mass.

The following, for instance, might seem to be such. She says: "Jesus demonstrated the power of Christian Science to heal mortal minds and bodies." One

would think that, if this is the case, there must be some plain statement of His own record to the effect that He was using what she calls "Christian Science" in His works of healing; but there is nothing, in fact, of the kind. All that this little sentence, then, amounts to is that He actually did heal mortal minds and bodies. The rest of it simply means that since Mrs. Eddy has "demonstrated" (that is to say, asserted) that there is no other power except Christian Science by which this can be done, so that it must claim the credit of all that He did in this line. One would think that even her followers would see how barefaced and groundless an assumption like this is; but no; they swallow it right down.

Then she goes on to say that this power was "lost sight of." But how could it be "lost sight of," if nobody before Mrs. Eddy ever had a sight of it? The actual works which she ascribes to it were not lost sight of, as she seems to imagine or, at any rate, to pretend; they have been going on steadily all the time in the Church, right down to the present day, and still continue. But she pays no attention to facts. If they don't correspond with her theory, which she calls "Science," so much the worse for them. It is impossible, according to her, *a priori,* for any works of healing to be done by those who do not believe in her teaching. "Its Science," she says, "must be apprehended by as many as believe on Christ, and spiritually understand Truth." Believing on Christ will not do; even spiritually understanding Truth is not sufficient. You must also apprehend Mrs. Eddy. And she is not so easy to apprehend, when she uses phrases like this, for instance, of "spiritually understanding Truth," which give no peg, as it were, to

hang an apprehension on. What is it, may we ask, to "spiritually" understand a thing? It must be, apparently, the same as to "mentally" understand it. But how can one mentally understand anything, with nothing but mortal mind to do it with? "Mortal mind," she tells us just below, "implies something untrue and therefore unreal: and as the phrase is used in teaching Christian Science, it is meant to designate that which has no real existence." We can't, then, according to her Science, even make this preliminary stop needed for her "Science," of "spiritually understanding Truth," for we have nothing which really exists to do it with.

As to her "Scientific Translation of Immortal Mind," a long document, which shortly follows, it is quite impossible to make anything out of it, for there is really nothing in it, but a jumble of statements, some of which everybody believes, some of which have no definite meaning, and some of which we can only trust that she herself did not believe. Of the last kind, we select the following choice "gem:" "Christian Science," she says, "attaches no physical nature and significance to the Supreme Being or His manifestation; mortals alone do this."

We ought to pass by as unworthy of notice the idea that even "unscientific" Christians regard the Supreme Being as corporeal, if that is what she means by "physical." They have always "emphasized" the statement that God is incorporeal, just as much as any "Scientist." And the word "physical," when not used in such a restricted technical sense, simply means "natural;" and this sentence, therefore, seems to mean that there is no Divine Nature at all, or at any rate, if there is, "Christian Science"

attaches no significance to it. In other words, the Divine Nature is insignificant.

After all, this may be too much, even for Mrs. Eddy. So, probably, she must mean "corporeal" when she says "physical." But then she goes on to tell us, that "God's essential language is spoken of in the last chapter of Mark's Gospel as the new tongue." the spiritual meaning of which is attained through "signs following." Now in point of fact, in this place she really garbles the Gospel from which she quotes. It does not speak of any "new tongue," but of "new tongues," and the words evidently do not have any special, or mystical meaning, but simply refer to corporeal tongues or languages personally unknown to the believers who were to use them. These were corporeal, if she allows that they were real at all; and so were the "signs following." They really were "manifestations of the Supreme Being." But Mrs. Eddy, it seems, will not allow them to be such. It is rather strange that when she gets the whole evidence of her so-called "Science" from them, of like phenomena, she insists that Science regards them as insignificant.

But here is something still more important. In passing, we may happen to notice a simple allusion to "His (Jesus') mighty, crowning, unparalleled, and triumphant exit from the flesh." She speaks of this as if it were a well-known fact, acknowledged by everyone. As no one, however, seems to have any information about it except herself, we should like, if Mrs. Eddy had not already made that exit, to have her tell us when it occurred. For she does not seem to be speaking of His death on the Cross. She attaches no special triumph to that. Moreover, that exit

of His was only for a brief time, at any rate; unless Mrs. Eddy chooses to doubt His own words, spoken after the Resurrection, to His Apostles, "See My hands and feet, that it is I Myself; handle, and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see Me to have."

The only line which Mrs. Eddy could take in this matter, without charging Our Lord with conscious fraud or deception, would be to say that Christ, Whom she calls "the Master," as not far enough advanced in Christian Science to know that He did not really have any flesh and bones, which He said, "You see Me to have," not "I seem to have." She would probably say that He was mistaken about that; it was an error of "mortal mind," which still clung to Him.

Or she, perhaps even more probably, would say that He had not then made the "exit from the flesh" to which she was alluding. That was made when He ascended into heaven. But the record tells us that "while they looked on He was raised up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight." His body went up till they could see it no longer on account of the cloud. No exit from the flesh on His part is recorded as having been seen, or in any way made known to us. What, then, should make Mrs. Eddy say so confidently that any such exit occurred? That was the last chance for us to have any evidence of it. Well, it is just of a piece with most of the other things which have any sense or meaning which she says. "I myself, am the evidence for it;" that is all that there is for her to say. "God, Spirit, Mind, revealed it to me. What more evidence do you want?"

Whatever her followers would think of this, it is to the unprejudiced mind the most extreme audacity

and absurdity for her to call her alleged discovery "Christian" Science, when Christ seems to have known nothing of it. Even her followers must, one would think, see that she is trying to get the shelter of His Name for what, even if it came from God, was unknown to Christ, and of course no science to His.

Why not come out in the open, and not make such a pretense? Why not have the courage, like her illustrious predecessor, Mahomet, to boldly say that "there is but one God, and Mrs. Eddy is His prophet?" He got along pretty well, and she might have done as well herself, on a similar platform. For, really, what she holds out to her believers is much the same sort of thing as what he promised to his. In his case, it was sensual pleasure; in hers it is very similar; that is to say, relief from sensual pain. How to have a good time, in this world as well as in the next, is the gospel for both. And it is a very good gospel to draw those who do not relish the idea of sacrifice, and do not see any use in it, or any need for it. It has always had a great many disciples.

A little farther on, Mrs. Eddy comes out with a statement which actually does have a definite meaning, a very unusual thing for her, and quite refreshing. It is easily seen to be erroneous, and it may be regarded as the chief cause of her other errors. It is in the form of a dilemma; and because there is some appearance of sense and logic in it, it is better worth looking at than most of the mere verbiage of which she is so lavish.

It is as follows: "When," she says, "we endow matter with vague spiritual power—that is when we do so in our theories, for of course we cannot really

endow matter with what it does not and cannot possess—we disown the Almighty, for such theories lead to one of two things: they either presuppose the self-evolution and self-government of matter, or else they assume that matter is the product of Spirit." She quite correctly says that "to seize the first horn of this dilemma, and to consider matter as a power in and of itself, is to leave the creator out of His own universe." But she is not so happy with the second horn. "To grasp this," she says, "and regard God as the creator of matter, is not only to make Him responsible for all disasters, physical and moral, but to announce Him as their source, thereby making Him guilty of maintaining perpetual misrule in the form and under the name of natural law."

Let us now see just what the error in this is. It would be quite true, if matter were the whole of what He has created. Of itself it always follows strictly the laws which He has laid down for it. But He has chosen to create something else, which does not work in the same way. This something else is what she calls "mortal mind." He has seen fit, for reasons which we cannot fathom of ourselves, and which He has not fully explained to us, to endow this other class of His creation with a faculty which matter does not possess; and this is the faculty or ability of *free will*. One reason for giving it seems to be the greater or additional glory resulting to Himself from being served and obeyed by a creature who is able to say, "I will not serve or obey," than by one who is so constituted as not to be able to do so. This glory is expressed, perhaps, most clearly in words which Mrs. Eddy had not been brought up to consider as inspired; and perhaps she may not have even known

anything about them. They are in themselves, of course, very clear. They are the following: "Who hath been tried thereby, and made perfect, he shall have glory everlasting. He that could have transgressed, and hath not transgressed: and could do evil things, and hath not done them: therefore are his goods established in the Lord" (Ecclus. xxxi. 10, 11).

But we do not need the words of inspiration to assure us of this; for it is a fact evident to our own consciousness. The early Reformers of the sixteenth century chose to deny this; and, as they could not deny that man did do evil things, they chose to deny that he was able to avoid them. By this they fell into the same fatal mistake as Mrs. Eddy, of making the All-Good the creator of evil, in this second horn of her dilemma. They were not able to get out of it. And how does she think that she gets out of it? Why, simply by denying the actual existence of matter. It would have been simpler to deny the existence of "mortal mind," as she sometimes does; that would have been quite sufficient. But as the great point which she had in view was the healing of bodily ills, and as this could not always be accomplished, the preferable way was to assert that there really were no bodily ills; that they were only a delusion of "mortal mind;" and in this way God is no longer responsible for them or any other material "disaster." But as she saw well enough that this delusion would be a mental "disaster," she had, sometimes at any rate, to also assert that there really is no "mortal mind." The difficulty, of course, brought in by this, would be that her second horn would vanish altogether, and reduce her argument to nothing.

If she had only been content with simply asserting

that the only existence was that of God, she could have got along well enough; but that would have knocked out the "sick" people, who were to be healed, and which were the underpinning for her whole system. But a great deal of her difficulty comes in by her simply insisting on her own ideas of what is good or bad. She says: "The lawgiver, whose lightning palsies or prostrates in death the child at prayer is not the divine ideal of omnipresent Love." She means, "is not Mrs. Eddy's ideal." It does not seem to even occur to her that anyone else, even God Himself, could have any idea different from hers. Many of us poor ordinary Christians, for instance, in this particular case, could easily account for it by the words of what we regard as Scripture: "He was taken away lest wickedness should alter his understanding or deceit beguile his soul" (Wisd. iv. 11).

Just a little word for a moment to show the inaccuracy so often found in her writing. She says, "In viewing the sunrise, one finds that it contradicts the evidence before the senses to believe that the earth is in motion, and the sun at rest." Begging her pardon, it does nothing of the kind. All that the senses tell us is that there is relative motion of the two. It may be worth these few words to remark that if one looks at the sunrise through a telescope which has a driving clock attached, the sun will appear to the senses as standing perfectly still, and the earth's horizon as plainly falling away from it. So it is by no means true that "the earth's diurnal relation is invisible to the physical eye," as she asserts on the next page but one.

She proceeds to argue on this point to something more important, but with equal and more evident

error. She says: "Health is not a condition of matter, but of Mind; nor can the material senses bear reliable testimony on the subject of health." Well, of course, we may have wrong ideas on the matter of health: but as far as the senses bear testimony, we can depend on them. It may be very healthy for a man to have his pulse beating two hundred times a minute; the senses give no testimony on that point, but only on the actual rate at which it is beating. Or it may be very healthy for his face to be covered with pustules of something which looks like small-pox, but the senses are correct in their testimony that the pustules, whatever they may be, are there.

It is not on the senses directly that the conclusions of physicians are based; but what is reasonably deduced from their evidence. It may be that a pulse of two hundred a minute is all right; but we know by reason and experience, that in all probability it is not.

Some of Mrs. Eddy's remarks, which she imagines to be scientific, are certainly rather amusing. For example, she says on the next page: "The barometer —that little prophet of storm and sunshine, denying the testimony of the senses—points to fair weather in the midst of murky clouds and drenching rain." One would think that this remark was made by some little boy or girl; and that it is, indeed, probable that Mrs. Eddy did not know what a barometer really is, or is meant for, as well as the average little boy or girl in these learned days.

What a real barometer does, and the only thing which it does, is to measure the pressure of the air. It does not, of itself, tell us anything at all about storm or sunshine. Those words are simply put on

aneroid barometers offered on sale, to interest the unscientific (or Eddian) public. Really the absolute reading of the barometer is not of much significance; it is the direction or amount of its *change* that is of importance. You can learn nothing about the weather by merely looking at a barometer; you have got to watch it, and see the way the hand is moving; and it is for this purpose, and so save the trouble of making successive notes of its position, that the little brass pointer, which is moveable by hand, but does not move otherwise, is attached. To do this is of some use to ship captains; but really not much toward forecasting the weather can be done without measurements of the barometric pressure made at various points over a large area and at regular intervals of time. And yet, comical as it really is, the poor woman actually brings up her own personal ignorance of the use of a barometer as one of the "illusions of material sense."

It is really astonishing that ordinarily intelligent people can be taken in by stuff like the following, which we find a little further on. But the book is full of the same sort of thing. "Our theories," she tells us, "make the same mistake regarding Soul and body that Ptolemy made regarding the solar system. They insist that soul is in body, and mind therefore tributary to matter." Of course the notion of "mind being tributary to matter" does not in any way follow from the connection evidently existing between soul and body, as long as it is held (as of course it is by all Christians) that the soul is the superior element, and that body, without it, has only some automatic functions of a lower order, and that even these cease when the two are separated.

The "error relating to soul and body" of which she here writes, is one which in reality hardly anyone holds; it is all in her own imagination; for the ordinary materialist does not admit the idea of soul at all. This is the same old fighting a man of straw, in which she so often indulges, and which is quite a favorite pastime with opponents of the plain truth of common sense.

"The verity of Mind," she adds, "shows conclusively how it is that matter seems to be, but is not." This sort of sentence is quite a favorite one with her. Her disciples, of course, swallow it right down, as if it really had some meaning. But unless the "verity" has some peculiar definition which she does not condescend to explain, it would mean simply "truth," or actual existence, of the thing which is stated to have "verity." But to maintain that the actual existence of "Mind" shows "conclusively" that matter has no actual existence is obviously a mere assertion on her part; not in any way a proof. It is perfectly conceivable that both Mind and matter have actual existence. Even if it were in some way proved that matter had no actual existence, it would not appear "how" the existence of Mind showed or proved this.

She now starts out on a special lucubration, to explain her use of the term "Christian Science." She says that she introduced it "to designate the scientific system of divine healing," and goes on to state that the "revelation" consists of two parts.

1. "The discovery of this divine Science of Mind-healing, through a spiritual sense of the Scriptures and through the teachings of the Comforter, as promised by the Master.

2. The proof, by present demonstration, that the so-called miracles of Jesus did not specially belong to a dispensation now ended, but that they illustrated an ever-operative divine Principle. The operation of this Principle indicates the eternality of the scientific order and continuity of being."

There seems to be no particular call for this second part of the "revelation" or "demonstration," as far as any new "Science" is concerned, as the great majority of Christians have never held that the miracles of Jesus belonged to a dispensation now ended, as these miracles have, by evidence unquestionable to those who will examine it, been going on continually ever since, right down to our own day. The Church has also always held that "they illustrated an ever operative divine Principle," for He had said: "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (We quote the Protestant version, as more familiar to Mrs. Eddy, and as being in a way more unmistakable than the Douay, which has "consummation" instead of "end.") Catholics, at any rate, have always expected these miracles, and have always had them; not because of any "eternality" of the scientific order and continuity of being (for Our Lord might have stopped them if He had so chosen), but simply because such was His promise. What, we may ask in passing, does she mean by "eternality." One always has to look out, in "Eddian" Science, for something behind which she hopes to take refuge, and spring from it on you at some time, unexpectedly. We do not find the word in the dictionary, and do not see how it is an improvement on the well known one "eternity."

Well, now to go back to the first part of the "revelation," which is the only part which seems to have

anything in it. This is the alleged discovery of "a divine Science of Mind-healing." It does not at first clearly appear whether this mind-healing is a healing of mind, or by mind; and we have ventured, tentatively, to amend her name for it, by putting mind with a small "m." For she cannot, surely, be undertaking to heal the Divine Mind. And as to mind-healing, (with a small "m") we have always supposed that this was the science which they try to get at in lunatic asylums.

So it seems that she must mean healing coming from "Mind," and that the capital "M" is right. But then, what is it that is to be healed? We shall have to go back to the small "m," for she has just now, as often before, told us clearly that "matter" does not exist. It is the healing of mind, not in the way of doctors in asylums, but by Mind. But here again, we run right into the old snag, about "mortal mind," which, she says, "in teaching Christian Science, is meant to designate that which has no real existence." One would almost begin to fear that "Christian Science" itself has no real existence.

Let us then try to examine if there is not something in it which has been puffed up by Mrs. Eddy into this great bubble, which with her and her disciples, occupies the whole field of view. We shall find that all that there really is in it has been well known for a long time, and comes in fact more or less within the experience of everyone. We all know that imagination has great power, and takes the place of fact, particularly with some people. And in the matter of our bodily ills and diseases, it has more effect than in almost anything else. Everyone knows the encouragement and actual benefit which one feels on being told

that he looks better, and the depression and harm resulting from hearing the contrary. Bread pills, supposed to contain medicine, may do a great deal of good. There is no need to multiply instances to prove mind-healing of this kind, that is to say the healing of the functions and even to some extent of the organs of the real, actual and material body, by the action of the controlling mind; for everyone grants it before you begin. There is no need for adding to the real evidence, at hand, a wild theory that matter has no existence, or another about "mortal mind," which leaves us guessing whether you believe or disbelieve in its existence, or are in doubt about it, or whether you are, perhaps, merely trying to confuse us about it, and pull the wool over our eyes.

You may be able to prove by actual facts that you can cure sick people by making them believe that they are not really sick; but you cannot make them really believe that they have no bodies to be sick with; though they may try to do so, if they are told that the whole thing goes together. And you don't believe it yourself; for your words are letting out your real belief all the time. The fact is that you really believe and can't help believing the same as we do, as to what you call your "Science." The chief real difference between us in the extent of possible influence of the mind (or soul) on the body; you maintain that it can go farther than most of us are inclined to admit. Bring on whatever facts you have, and your evidence as solid as possible. People who are really scientific are not afraid of evidence.

As to the effect of what you call "Mind" (that is to say God Himself) on the body, all Christians are as sure as you are that this effect is unlimited.

God, as He has created the body, can destroy it, or do anything that He pleases with it. But the weak point in your theory is that you can, according to it, if you are "scientific" enough, identify yourself with this infinite "Mind and produce the effect you desire, independently of His Will. That is what seems to you the strong point in it, instead of the weak one; but, in fact, it is simply a weak and foolish, not to say blasphemous, attempt to climb on to His Throne. But we are not inclined to make a real difference between us out of this; you don't mean it, that is all; at any rate, we hope so.

Well, let us go on a little farther, to see the follies into which a blind attempt to carry out a so-called "Science" may lead one. One fundamental difficulty with Mrs. Eddy, personally, seems to have been that she never could conceive of the establishment by the Creator of any force or energy anywhere outside of Himself. It would not suffice for her that He could control or direct at any moment such a force of energy; no, it must all come from Him directly. She says that "the universe, like man, is to be interpreted by a Science from its divine Principle, God, and then it can be understood." But apparently she cannot understand or admit any action, though perfectly normal, regular, and in accordance with God's plan, which He can intrust—so to speak—to anything besides himself. So she says: "Adhesion, cohesion, and attraction are properties of Mind. They belong to divine Principle, and support the equipoise of that thought-force which launched the earth in its orbit, and said to the proud wave, 'Thus far and no farther.'"

Of course the last part of the above, with its

"equipoise, thought-force," etc., in just the usual Eddian stuff; but the idea mentioned above, which causes her difficulty, emerges. She does not, or will not, admit that "Mind," or God, could impart to matter any properties like "adhesion, cohesion or attraction." It seems to her, indeed, that matter can neither act in any way, nor oppose any obstacle to any action on it, from which she quite naturally concludes that it can have no real existence. She feels equally sure that the same ought to hold with regard to spirit (or "mind" with a small m). But she has to account in some way for the "sick" people, the removal of whom is the whole motive for her "science," so she has to desperately fall back on something which she calls "mortal mind," which is neither God, nor anything created by Him. Of course it has no real or actual existence, any more than matter has; but it is just as good to talk about as if it had. It would seem that she simply cannot understand or will not admit that God can lodge or implant any force in His creation, and be able to take it back.

"We tread," she says, "on forces. Withdraw them and creation must collapse." She cannot conceive that God could modify or change these forces, even for a moment. "Human knowledge," she says, "calls them forces of matter. But divine Science declares that they belong wholly to Divine Mind." Of course every Christian holds that they do, and he does not need any Eddian Science to assure him of the fact. But that does not prevent God's creation of matter, or His implanting in it of certain forces; which may, while this state of things, according to His will, continues, be called "forces of matter." If

He choses to "withdraw" them (of course we cannot do this of ourselves) it is not creation, but Eddian Science, which "must collapse." She uses again the word "inherent," with the meaning of being "stuck" inextricably. She says that these forces are "inherent" in this Mind, which seems to mean that if He could let them go, He could not get them back again, or make any use of them while they were gone.

From these false notions, she draws, but quite illogically, some startling conclusions. "The seasons," she tells us, "will come and go with changes of time and tide, cold and heat, latitude and longitude." (What she means by this last is not clear, unless she is referring to the slight variation, lately discovered by astronomers, in the position on the earth's surface of the terrestrial pole. We hardly think, however, that she had heard anything about that for she doesn't seem quite up to date about astronomy.) But for some reason, not apparent to "mortal mind," she tells us that "the agriculturist will find that these changes cannot effect his crops." Of course, as it is, if they go on regularly or normally, they don't affect his crops, for his planting, ploughing, etc., is done in accordance with them. But if even in his "mortal belief," there appeared to be a big change in cold or heat, or, at any rate, if "mortal" observations should show such a change in latitude that the pole came and settled down in Illinois, for example, even the most ardent supporters of Mrs. Eddy would hardly, we fear, be able to believe that the crops would not be affected. The idea, if there was any at all in her mind, seems, for the moment, to have been that "time and tide, cold and heat, latitude and longitude," were

not merely matters of "mortal belief;" though why they should be exceptions to the general rule about "matter" does not appear. But really it is hardly worth while to treat such stuff as this seriously, or even jocosely.

She continually hangs on, or as she would say, "adheres," in this chapter, to the idea that natural science is, with those who believe in it, built on the false hypothesis "that matter is its own lawgiver," or that material conditions "are final and overrule the might of divine Mind." The plain and universal Christian belief that God is the author, creator and preserver—so long as He chooses—of all that exists, she simply ignores, and blinds herself to everything except her own weird notion that the only conceivable alternative to what she calls "natural science" is to deny the actual existence of His creation entirely.

To escape from the charge of pantheism, naturally and rightfully made against her doctrine, Mrs. Eddy, on her next page, proceeds to give a definition of pantheism. She says: "Pantheism may be defined as a belief in the intelligence of matter." Of course it may be defined in this way, or in any way that one may choose. But she wants to give the idea by this, that such is the universal and—as she would perhaps say, "inherent"—definition of it; or, perhaps, that this is really the only definition.

Of course, however, the etymological definition of the word would be got at by taking the two Greek words of which it is composed; namely "Pan," which means All, and "Theos" which means God; which would make it mean that All is God; or in other words that nothing exists except God, which is a brief statement of Mrs. Eddy's "Science." It is

simply a form or variety of pantheism. And it is equally plain that the definition which she gives of "pantheism" has nothing whatever in it of what is expressed by the two words of which it is composed. This definition of hers does not say that God is all; indeed it doesn't say anything about God *at all.* It simply says something about *matter;* it doesn't even say that matter *is all;* it only mentions one particular idea about it, namely, that it has intelligence.

She cannot seem to free herself from the notion that there are some people, somewhere, that are holding this particular idea or belief about matter. Who they are does not appear. The ordinary materialist does not have any such idea; and we have never heard of any Christian who does. Perhaps Mrs. Eddy, in the course of her wanderings, may have come across some such people, and it is possible that she may have been one of them herself. And not knowing what to call them, she thinks that perhaps the name of "pantheist" might fit them, though she does not seem to know exactly what it properly would mean.

A most unaccountable little remark appears shortly after this. She says: "The generous liver may object to the author's small estimate of the pleasures of the table." We are somewhat puzzled to understand where in her book this "small estimate" is to be found; at any rate to any extent that the "generous liver" could object to it. It would seem rather funny for a book on religion, as this of hers may be called, to dwell with great enthusiasm on the pleasures of the table. We hardly see why the most "generous liver" could expect it to do so. But most spiritual books that we know of treat more plainly

of the dangers of such pleasures than Mrs. Eddy seems disposed to do. Most of them have some good word to say for asceticism; but all she has to say about it, in her long chapter on "Atonement and Eucharist," is that "Jesus was no ascetic," which seems to be rather in favor of the "generous liver" than otherwise. One can hardly help wondering where she has met with these petty intellects who are, as she tells us, alarmed at her "constant appeals to Mind." One would think that the alarm would rather be at finding in her book so little appeal to "mind" (with a small "m").

But we must pass on to the next section, on what she calls

"THEOLOGY."

In the beginning of it, it is worth while to notice the calmness with which this amateur theologian fits in any words of Our Lord, whether having any reference to her doctrines or not, as being an approval by Him of them.

"In reply," she says, "to John's inquiry (John being St. John Baptist), 'Art thou He that shall come?' Jesus returned an affirmative reply, 'Go and show John again those things which you do hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in Me."

The natural meaning of these words, obvious enough to all of us, and even to Mrs. Eddy, is that by the Divine power manifested in the wonderful works mentioned, it was plain that He Who worked them was indeed the One "that should come." But all that she

chooses to make out of them is merely that "He gave his benediction to anyone who should not deny that such effects, coming from divine Mind, prove the unity of God—the divine principle which brings out all harmony."

She seizes what seems to her a suitable occasion to bring out her "Science" catch-words about "Mind," "Principle," and "harmony," though there is not the slightest reference to them in the actual words of Christ. Of course her justification for this would be that He must have had these catch-words in mind, though perhaps not very clearly; that He must have had an incipient idea about this great revelation which Mrs. Eddy (whose forerunner He was) was to bring out much more completely. He Himself was a "student," but, of course, a very imperfect one, in her great school of Eddian Science. That she assigns to Him this place, so low compared with her own, is plain enough throughout her book.

A curious example of the carelessness on her part of what does not affect her own glory or her pet notions, is to be found soon after this. She says: "This righteous preacher" (that is all that St. John is to her) "once pointed his disciples to Jesus as 'the Lamb of God,' yet afterward he seriously questioned the signs of the Messianic appearing, and sent the inquiry to Jesus, 'Art thou He that should come?'"

She seems to forget, or not care to notice, that the occasion on which St. John called Jesus the Lamb of God, was that of Our Lord's baptism by him, where he also testified that Jesus was He Who baptizeth with the Holy Ghost (John i. 33). Anyone, except Mrs. Eddy, would see that, after this, St. John did not "seriously," or in any way, "question the signs of

the Messianic appearing;" that he only sent the inquiry to Jesus, "Art thou He that should come?" in order that our Blessed Lord might Himself announce that He was indeed that One, with His own Divine authority and majesty. But she is so blinded by her own pride that she can't see even the most obvious things. What absurdity to suppose that St. John seriously questioned who our Divine Lord was, after he had said of Him: "Behold the Lamb of God, behold Him Who taketh away the sin of the world" (John i. 29).

She actually proceeds on the next page to make out that the healing of the Israelites (Num. xxi. 9) was only a "belief that they were healed." According to her, there was nothing the matter with them before the healing, except a silly notion that snake bites were injurious, and all that was needed was to get rid of such a nonsensical idea. We rather think that Mrs. Eddy always clung to this notion, however, and would not have wanted to show its foolishness in her own case by any rash experiments.

In the next paragraph comes another wild imagination, that the indignation of the Jews against Christ was due to His teaching of good orthodox Eddian pantheism. Again, on the next page, she says: "Denial of the possibility of Christian healing robs Christianity of the very element which gave it divine force." Quite true; but who, among Christians, denies this possibility? All that any of us deny is that you can't cure sick people by merely asserting that they are not sick. It may work, if there is really not much the matter with them; but if they are just plain hypochondriacs, it may only make them all the more confident that they are right and you are wrong.

There is not much in the rest of this section on "Theology" which calls for special comment or criticism. Throughout the whole of it, however, one finds, cropping out here and there, her continual taking for granted that what she calls "popular theology," or Christianity as generally understood, teaches that God has left man entirely under the control of the material forces which He has established, and that He has nothing to do with the world which He has created. She insists on claiming as a special discovery of her own so-called "Science" that there is or can be any "triumph of Spirit, Mind over matter." According to her, if anybody has this idea at the present day, they got it from her. If such an idea existed at any previous time, it must, she imagines, have been lost.

In fact, however, it has always been held, and is at present by all Christians who are not merely nominal ones, that God has now, as He always has had, complete supremacy and control over His whole universe. If they had not this belief, they would never say a prayer. But they actually do this, frequently, with regard to all matters which they cannot help seeing, that the power which He has committed to themselves is not sufficient. They pray, of course, mainly for spiritual graces and energies for the resisting of sin and the attainment of virtue; but they are not indifferent to Mrs. Eddy's special hobby of "curing the sick." Prayers for the sick are continually offered; and such prayers would not be offered, did not Christians know that they were frequently answered. But they also believe, as their very faith obliges them to believe, that curing sick people in general, or even themselves when they are sick, is not the most important thing in the world. They recognize, as Mrs.

Eddy apparently does not, that spiritual blessings may come from bodily disease; but she considers disease the one principal evil which afflicts us, and that every trouble in serving God that we can suffer comes from our being sick, or from imagining that we are sick.

She certainly seems to hold that our Blessed Lord's great object in this world was to heal the sick; or, as she would say, to rid them of the dangerous error of "mortal mind" that they were sick. And yet it may be remarked in passing, that she herself seems to have finally succumbed to this dangerous error; unless when she was about to die, she still thought that there was nothing the matter with her, which seems hard to believe.

It must be acknowledged that on the point of entirely avoiding death, she is rather non-committal in this book. She says: "The adoption of scientific religion and of divine healing will ameliorate sin, sickness, and death." This word "ameliorate" is, of course, somewhat ambiguous. But if it only means that it will make sickness and death easier or less painful, why say "scientific," or bring in the words "divine healing?" Any kind of sincere religion will "ameliorate" sin, sickness, and death. One can hardly help a lurking suspicion that, when writing these words, she still thought it quite possible that she might die, after all, and that it would be well to cast an anchor to windward (as the saying is) if that should prove to be the case.

Let us proceed to her views in the next section, called

"Medicine."

Mrs. Eddy starts out here with statements rather

more wild and absurd than any previously made by her. We are staggered in the very begininng by the audacity of the following, which she appears to present as an argument: "God," she says, "being All-in-all, He made medicine; but," she concludes, "that medicine was Mind." The rather important premise, which she suppresses, may as well be given. The thing should read: "God, being All-in-all, He made medicine. But, being All-in-all, He could not make anything outside of Himself." Therefore that medicine was Mind (which is her word for God). This suppressed premise is, obviously, simply a denial of the possibilities of Creation. But the first premise becomes still more astounding; for it is reduced by this to the statement that "God made God."

We always understood that God was self-existent; that He was not "made" at all. And indeed she has just acknowledged this, herself. Probably, however, this was not exactly meant for an argument. But still she must have had some sort of idea in this first paragraph. Its very first words are: "Which was first, Mind or medicine? If Mind was first and self-existent, then Mind, not matter, must have been the first medicine." Of course everyone of us who believes in the creation of matter holds that the Creator exists prior to the thing created; or if she chooses to put it so, that Mind is the *first* medicine, in the logical order as well as in that of time. But to infer from this that Mind is the *only* medicine; or in other words, that the creating Mind is unable to give to what He has created any power or effect to do anything whatever, because He Himself could do the same thing without its assistance, by no means follows. And it is not only contrary to common sense and

universal experience, but is also a limitation on the power of Mind. And yet, it is probable that many are deceived by such stuff as this. She goes right on with the same kind of thing.

"It is plain," she says, "that God does not employ drugs or hygiene, nor provide them for human use." Really, however, that is just the very thing that He does do. She might just as well say, that God does not provide anything for us to eat, or at any rate, that He does not show us how to cook it. He leaves us to find out these things, like so many others, for ourselves.

Another most obvious fallacy meets us in the very next sentence. "The sick are more deplorably lost than the sinning," she says, "if the sick cannot rely on God for help and the sinning can." What Christian ever said that the sick cannot rely on God for help, when we all pray to Him for such help for them? Also, this remark would mean that it is more deplorable to be sick, than to be a sinner. This really seems to be her idea, as she apparently regards the healing of the sick (in the usual sense of the word) as Christ's chief work on earth. She absolutely ignores the actual belief and practice of Christians in general, of using both medicine and prayer in case of illness, and insists that we must cut out either one or the other. She finishes this paragraph with the fine sounding (perhaps) but utterly unmeaning maxim, "The body is not controlled scientifically by a negative mind." What in the world is meant by controlling the body scientifically, or by a *negative* mind? The plain truth is that Christians use drugs, as well as "Mind," for the sick, because there are the surest indications that such, usually, is the will of God.

It is rather amusing, by the way, with her great desire and pretence to "science," that she does not seem to know what is meant by "the science (so called) of physics," or that it is concerned with matter as inanimate. She seems to think it is the same as that of medicine. This same blunder occurs five pages further on. "The universal belief in physics," she says (meaning "physic"), "weighs against the high and mighty truths of Christian metaphysics," which, she soon tells us, is taught in Christian Science; though it is hard to find it. She tells us that in metaphysics, "matter disappears from the remedy entirely," not realizing that "metaphysics," properly defined, has nothing whatever to do with "remedies."

She goes back a little later, to a conundrum about the drug business, already alluded to. "If God creates drugs at all and designs them for medical use, why did Jesus not employ them and recommend them for the treatment of disease?" The answer to this, from our point of view, is very easy. It was simply that we might see the superiority of the supernatural, when God wishes us to use it, to the merely natural. But there is no evidence that He does so wish all the time. Indeed the human life of Jesus Himself was mainly on natural lines.

There is just one other little paragraph in this chapter which may be worth noticing, for it is really too amusing to let pass. It is as follows: "You say," she remarks, "a boil is painful; but that is impossible, for matter without mind is not painful. The boil simply manifests, through inflammation and swelling, a belief in pain, and this belief is called a boil."

Everyone, of course, knows very well, that for any-

thing whatever to be painful, there must be some mind to feel the pain. And that mind must have a special union with the body in which the actual material boil exists; you can't feel somebody else's boil, though of course you may easily see it. You can, however, as for example by some local anæsthetic, partly cut off the union between body and mind so that you will cease to *feel* your own boil, though you know it is there; and that it would be painful, if you had not cut, for the time being, the connection between body and mind. But it is simply nonsense to say that this belief in pain *is* the boil. You know it is there, all the time, just as well as ever. There is such a thing as a painless abscess, which may go on and swell up to a large size; but it isn't a "belief in pain," for there isn't any actual pain, or any belief in the existence of any. Isn't it astonishing that people can be taken in by such stuff as this?

Mrs. Eddy's remedy for a boil (and it ought to work just the same for an abscess of the kind just mentioned) is to "administer to the patient a high attenuation of truth." We think that a good solid dose of truth and common sense would be better than an "attenuation."

There is another curious example in the chapter of the making of an argument out of what is merely a theory of her own. She takes for granted that homœopathy is the accepted school of medicine, and naturally enough asks, "If drugs are an antidote to disease, why lessen the antidote? If drugs are good things, is it safe to say that the less in quantity you have of them the better?" Well, this really is a fair argument against homœopathy; but it calmly ignores the fact that most people do not believe in the latter. The

present writer happened to be brought up, as a child, on that system, and got through various illnesses on it; and probably would have got through them (as he had a good constitution) without any medicine at all. But having at one time a rather severe attack of fever and ague, the doctor (who was not a very strict practitioner) concluded, after trying the little pellets for quite a while, that it might be well to make a change, and gave him, to his great surprise, a good stiff dose of quinine; and the effect being satisfactory, kept on with the same, which got the trouble out of his system, so that it has never returned.

I do not claim to have refuted homœopathy by this one fact; or even by many similar ones which might be argued; but it can hardly be used as an argument for Eddian Science. Mrs. Eddy is, however, probably enough right in saying that there is too much drugging, and giving of strong medicines without necessity; and that harm results from this. But this is not the same as saying that drugs are never useful. And we can't help suspecting that she may herself have kept a little quinine on the sly, to be used when really needed, when her Science did not seem to work; or, as a kind of short cut, to save needless strain on it.

In conclusion of this chapter, we can hardly pass by the remark she makes just at its end, as follows: "If you or I," she says, " should appear to die, we should not be dead." We don't, perhaps, quite get the proper force of this. But we can't quite see how it is that Mrs. Eddy is not now, in the universally accepted sense of the word, as dead as a door nail. And we don't see why she was so carefully boxed up in concrete, if it were not to hide the evidence of this

fact. If it is not a fact, it will be rather awkward. Her next chapter is very similar to this one. It is headed

CHAPTER VII.

Physiology.

We don't quite see why Mrs. Eddy made a special chapter out of this. It is the same old hodge-podge and medley, which she has been working on all the time. One idea, however, which comes in the course of it, has certainly some novelty and ingenuity. She says:

"If a dose of poison is swallowed through mistake, and the patient dies, even though physician and patient are expecting favorable results, does human belief, you ask, cause this death? Even so, and as directly as if the poison had been intentionally taken. In such cases," she continues, "a few persons believe the poison swallowed by the patient to be harmless, but the vast majority of mankind, though they know nothing of this particular case, and this special person, believe the arsenic, the strychnine, or whatever the drug used, to be poisonous, for it is set down as a poison by mortal mind. Consequently, the result is controlled by the majority of opinions, not by the infinitesimal minority of opinions in the sick-chamber."

Well this certainly opens the door wide enough to let in an ample excuse for any failures in Eddian Science. But it is hard to see how she can account for its ever succeeding, if things are to go in such a democratic way, by a majority vote in every case. For she now tells that the patient's own opinion, or that of his friends, counts for hardly anything. "The

result is controlled," she says, "entirely by what people in general think, even though unaware of the particular case."

Well, then, the general belief is, for instance, that a certain per cent of people will die if attacked by typhus fever, or some other kind of dangerous disease. We had supposed that there was no danger, even in such a disease, for a good 'scientific" patient, especially in charge of a good "scientific" practitioner. But now it appears that it is only the opinion of the unscientific crowd outside of the charmed circle of Eddian Science which counts. The typhus fever is just like the poisonous drug. If people in general think that your "science" won't help you, then it won't; that is all there is about it. To conform to the popular belief, you will have to fall back on the medicine or treatment that would popularly be thought most effective. And you would not have so good a chance, on account of your lack of belief in it, as if you belonged to the majority yourself. Your science is an injury to you, not a help. It would evidently be better to "get on to the band wagon." Better drop your "science," and behave like other people.

The "man of straw" whom we have to notice so often, comes in a few pages after this with more prominence than usual, though he is lurking around, more or less, all the time. "To admit," she says, "that sickness is a condition over which God has no control, is to presuppose that omnipotent power is powerless on some occasions." That is obviously true; it is just saying the same thing in two different ways. But what Christian "admits" anything of the kind?

It would seem that she simply cannot get rid of the idea that the Christian faith, as usually held, teaches that matter has its own laws, and that God has nothing to do with them. She must have got this notion in her early days from hearing that the age of miracles has passed, and has understood it as being a sort of polite way of saying that there never was any such age, and that there could never have been any.

So she thinks that she has entirely knocked out the underpinning from the ordinary unscientific Christian, by remarking that the senses and all other indications of life disappear when the body is left without a mind to control it; as if anyone ever imagined that they were a consequence of its simply material formation. "If we take away this erring mind," she gravely says, "the mortal material body loses all appearance of life or action, and this so-called mind then calls itself dead." "Calls *itself* dead?" What Christian calls it so? He simply calls his body dead, because he knows that it cannot, by its merely material formation, exercise the *vital* powers which the soul can produce in it when united to it.

She ventures, later on, to go a step further. She seemingly is not able to get the idea that even the Creator can give any energy to matter without giving it intelligence in the use of that energy; and that nobody could, for a moment, suppose such a thing to be possible. She actually says in her next chapter: "Material substances or mundane functions, astronomical calculations, and all the paraphernalia of speculative theories, based on the hypothesis of material law or *life and intelligence resident in matter*" (as if these two, "law" and "intelligence," were identical

or inseparable), "will ultimately vanish, swallowed up in the infinite calculus of Spirit."

But there is not the slightest reason to suppose that this "infinite calculus of Spirit," whatever it may be, will make any difference whatever in the laws which Spirit has, in His infinite wisdom, laid down for matter; to remain permanently, unless He chooses to destroy it altogether. The planets, as one would think even Mrs. Eddy herself would have seen, have not "mortal minds" to vitiate our calculations on them.

This strange notion that she somehow got into her head, that the material laws, which the wisdom of the Creator laid down for the material part of His creation, are only something trumped up by "mortal mind," instead of being actual facts, discovered with God's help, by it, is probably the cause and the explanation of most of her vagaries. But the strange thing is that she has been able to impose this foolish notion on so many whom one would suppose to be fairly intelligent people.

But without wasting any more time on this chapter, which is mainly a mere repetition of what she had previously tried to impose on our common sense, let us pass on to the next, which she calls

"Footsteps of Truth."

Our old acquaintance, the "straw man," makes his appearance rather early in this. She says: "Grafting holiness upon unholiness, supposing that sin can be forgiven when it is not forsaken, is as foolish as straining out gnats and swallowing camels."

This seems to be a sort of relic of the Lutheran theology, in which she must, we suppose, have been

brought up, and which, as she imagines, is the regular, orthodox, or historical teaching of the Christian Church. She does not seem to know that it has been practically abandoned long ago, or that it is generally recognized now that for sin to be forgiven, it must be forsaken, at any rate in the serious intention and purpose of the sinner; though the complete carrying out of this intention may, on account of human frailty, be realized only by a few. But what connection it has with her special Eddian views, is not at all clear, unless it be that for a real genuine "scientist," it is impossible to commit even the smallest sin. She might perhaps have said that if a "scientist" does sometimes fall into sin, it is because he has not yet thoroughly mastered his "science," or got thoroughly "in accord with the divine Principle of his being;" to use her own words, which one finds a little later.

But of course this is just what the Christian Church has always said, though it doesn't use these catchwords about "Science," and "Principle of being." It is only by the Divine union, which Christ came to obtain for us, that sin can be overcome. That is what He chiefly came for, to heal not our bodies, but our souls. To heal a bodily illness, and to hope by that to heal sin, the illness of the soul, is to put the cart before the horse. When "immortal man" to use her words, does get "thoroughly in accord with the divine Principle of his being," it is quite true that "he neither sins, suffers, nor dies." But that is no Eddian discovery; the Church has taught that all along.

She says: "We rely on a drug to heal disease, as if senseless matter had more power than omnipotent Spirit." If we "relied on a drug" to get rid of sin, she would be quite justified in this criticism. But as

things actually are, God has left the body largely in the control of His own material laws, which have not lost their efficacy by our soul-sickness, and which will work without being affected by it. Their working may be more effectual if the soul-sickness is more or less cured; but that is not because they themselves work in any different way, but because we interfere less with their work.

She says, in the next paragraph: "Common opinion admits that a man may take cold in the act of doing good." It would be better to put "common sense" instead of "common opinion," for there is no doubt whatever that such a thing *may* happen. It is not, of course, that his doing good makes him take cold, but that in doing it he runs against some natural law, the effect of which God does not choose to nullify, though in some other way He may compensate for it.

To take a practical example. If a man sees a burning fuse attached to a barrel of gunpowder, he will do a good act by trying to put it out. He may not succeed, and the result may be that he will be blown up, whereas he might have saved himself by running away in time. Or a man may be drowned in trying to save another man, who might have saved himself if he had been left alone. It is quite evident, in such cases, and many others which might be adduced, that what Mrs. Eddy calls "evil" does "check the reward for doing good," in spite of her saying, "as if evil could overbear the law of Love."

The fact is, that "common opinion" though admitting, as she says, that such a thing may happen, holds that the man who suffers for his heroism, gets from God a reward better than the one which he has lost. "In the Science of Christianity," Mrs. Eddy

says, "Mind assigns sure rewards to righteousness;" but it does not show "that matter cannot make sick nor destroy." She lugs in "create;" but in the proper sense of the word every Christian agrees to that.

She goes on with more of the same sort of stuff. "We are prone," she says, "to believe in more than one Supreme Ruler." Excuse me, but whatever Mrs. Eddy may confess as to herself, Christians in general are not *prone* to believe that at all. And she goes on, as if it were all the same thing, "or in some power less than God." We *are* "prone" to believe in that, which is quite a different matter. But we do *not* believe that there is any power not completely subject to God.

"When the material body has gone to ruin," she continues, "when evil has overtaxed the belief of life in matter and destroyed it, then mortals believe that the deathless Principle, or soul, escapes from matter and lives on; but this is not true." Well if this is not true, it seems to be a bad lookout for all of us, including Mrs. Eddy. It really seems strange that she should have said—or at any rate written—a thing like that. But perhaps she really did not expect even to seem to die.

The straw man soon pokes his head out again. "Befogged in error," she says (the error of believing that matter can be intelligent for good or evil), "we can catch clear glimpses of God only as the mists disperse." We wonder if Mrs. Eddy ever had the belief that "matter can be intelligent." We never heard of anyone else that had it. There seems to be a good deal of "befogging" about what she writes; perhaps this was just a specimen of it. Perhaps the straw man, after all, was just herself.

Really, it is hard to plough through such a mass of stuff as we find in this chapter, where almost every paragraph is either a truism or an absurdity, and hardly any sentence has any connection with the one which preceded it. We must just quote one choice and good-sized gem of unmeaning nonsense:

"The spiritual reality is the scientific fact in all things. The spiritual fact, repeated in the action of man and the whole universe, is harmonious and is the ideal of Truth. Spiritual facts are not inverted; the opposite discord, which bears no resemblance to spirituality, is not real. The only evidence of this inversion is obtained from suppositional error, which affords no proof of God, Spirit, or of the spiritual creation. Material sense defines all things materially, and has a finite sense of the infinite."

We defy anyone to make any "material sense," or any kind of sense, out of this.

Here is another little gem: "The immanent sense of Mind-power enhances the glory of Mind. Nearness, not distance, lends enchantment to this view."

Another: "Because immortal sense has no error of sense, it has no sense of error; therefore it is without a destructive element." Probably that was the trouble with Mrs. Eddy. We have often wondered what was the matter with her. It must be that she had "immortal" sense, though what that is is not plain to those of us who just have the common or "garden" variety. So, even when she fell into the most glaring errors, she had no sense by which to detect them. She had nothing in her destructive of them, as most other people have.

This childish stuff about "intelligence in matter" reappears in the very next paragraph to this: "If

brains, nerves, stomach," she says with apparent seriousness, "are intelligent—if they talk to us, tell us their condition, and report how they feel"—well, that will do before going on. It is simply astonishing that anyone can be impressed in any way except disgust by such stuff as this. She might just as well say, "if a clock is intelligent, if it can tell us the time of day, or—if it has an alarm—can inform us of a terrible convulsion going on in its vitals," etc. No one, except Mrs. Eddy, was ever so foolish as to imagine that this would show any "intelligence" in a clock. It does show, of course, intelligence in the person who designed or made the clock. It is the familiar "argument from design," which is used by Paley, and a host of others. If one finds a watch lying around in some desert place, no sensible person imagines that it just happened to grow there, or to be a fortuitous concourse of atoms, but naturally feels sure that somebody made it, and for the express purpose of keeping time; and that somebody had it, and lost it or threw it away. But no one would think for a moment that the watch, so found, must be an "error of mortal mind," and couldn't possibly be real, for if it were, it would show "intelligence in matter."

And indeed, it doesn't seem possible that Mrs. Eddy herself really took any stock—except in a literal pecuniary way—in nonsense like this. In that way, of course, perhaps she did. She may have thought it might impose on some one, and help to sell her book; especially if dressed up in some high sounding words, like the following, which immediately follow those quoted from her in the beginning of this "gem." "If," etc., she continues, "then Spirit and matter, Truth and error, commingle and produce sickness and

health, good and evil, life and death; and who shall say whether Truth or error is the greater?"

One doesn't like to accuse anyone—especially a lady—of a deliberate attempt to deceive in important matters, or of committing any other grave moral fault; but really it does seem impossible that anyone, however stupid, could get so much "befogged in error" as to write anything of this kind, and be deluded by it himself.

A page or so later on there is a passage which calls for more serious attention than those which we have quoted; though it begins with the same stupidity about "intelligence in matter." But on the whole, it is a sort of "lucid interval" in her usual raving.

"If it is true," she remarks, "that nerves have sensation, that matter has intelligence, that the material organism causes the eyes to see and the ears to hear, then, when the body is dematerialized, these faculties must be lost, for their immateriality is not in Spirit, whereas the fact is that only through dematerialization and spiritualization or thought can these faculties be conceived of as immortal."

There is undoubtedly a mystery here, which, however, what Mrs. Eddy says does not at all help to clear up. Of course nobody pretends that matter has intelligence, as we have said all along. All that matter does in the cases which she mentions, as far as we can as yet discover, is to form a picture on the retina of the eye, or a vibration in the drum of the ear; but how the mind can get hold of this picture or vibration any better than it can of the actual objects outside which they reproduce, is not evident, and perhaps never will be, in this world.

The mystery of the transit from matter to mind re-

mains the same as it was. And it is certainly true that when the connection between the two is broken by death, we do not at present understand what can take its place. The trouble, of course, is that all our knowledge of matter is obtained by the senses, which, however, being a Divine gift to us, cannot, when working normally, deceive us. But what right have we to assert that God cannot or will not substitute something else beside the senses to which we are accustomed to make this transit for us, with even a more perfect security from error than what they now afford? It therefore is not true that when they are gone, the faculties which they now give *must* be lost. What are we thus to set limits to the power of the Omnipotent? A faculty is not lost when it is improved.

Mrs. Eddy, of course, wants to prove that these faculties or senses do not, now, give us any true information; as if they were not given to us from God, but something which we ourselves had invented by "mortal mind." If this last were really the case, it would be quite true that they could not be depended on; but the fact is that our experience in using them, by the harmony or accordance of its results, shows us the Source from which they have come. So, in trying to exalt "Mind" by denying the existence of matter, she really is insulting (or blaspheming) "Mind," by accusing it of falsehood and deceit.

This false idea of hers about matter makes her write paragraphs like the following: "Mortals have a modus of their own, undirected and unsustained by God. They produce a rose through seed and soil, and bring the rose into contact with the olfactory nerves that they may smell it."

Well, this is certainly quite an achievement, to produce a rose unsustained by God. But we did not know that it could be done. She goes on. "In legerdemain and credulous frenzy, mortals believe that unseen spirits produce the flowers." We have never met mortals of this kind. They can't be very common. We wonder who they were. Mrs. Eddy seems to have had some strange acquaintances.

In the remainder of the chapter, she goes maundering on, very much on the same old lines as usual. Occasionally she makes a funny slip, like one a few pages further on, in which she seems to think that "infinity" and "finity" (a term which she seems to have invented) refer to size. "Remember," she says, "that truth is greater than error, and that we cannot put the greater into the less;" seemingly having in mind the old saying, that "you cannot put a quart into a pint-pot." "Soul is Spirit, and Spirit is greater than body. If Spirit were once within the body, Spirit would be finite, and therefore could not be Spirit," she sagely remarks; as if spirit had, like body, its geometrical dimensions.

She makes, however, in this chapter and the one preceding, some practical cautions about not paying too much attention to ailments by rules or theories of diet, or hygiene. She carries them rather too far sometimes in the book, probably rather farther than in her own personal practice; from what she writes one might infer that she never took a bath, used a flesh brush, or (perhaps) even a toothbrush. But still it may be that in these times this sort of thing may receive more attention than it really deserves. A good deal of this self-doctoring, as it may be called, probably has come from the little books, especially

popular among homœopaths, in which they are instructed what particular little pellet is the right one to take for every symptom which may be noticed. By means of these one can always feel sure, if skilled in consulting the book, that this calls for "Bryonia," or that for "Pulsatilla." The best general practical rule, probably, is not to mind about trifling ailments, and when more serious ones occur to send for a doctor, who understands the causes of them better than you do by a more thorough knowledge of the subject. To worry about every little symptom is a mistake, as surely as it would be to kick the doctor overboard altogether. Only, if one confines oneself to very small pills of medicine which is much diluted, it would really seem that it cannot do much harm; and by bringing "mind" to the rescue, may secure, to a great extent, all the good which can be got from "Christian Science."

But there is not much practical danger of quiddling, as it may be called, too much, in the matter of soul-sickness, which is commonly called "sin." Mrs. Eddy, however, thinks that the right course about this, as in body-sickness, is (to use her own words) to "hold yourself superior" to it. "To hold yourself superior to sin," she tells us, "is true wisdom." The trouble about this, however, is that it isn't of any use to "hold yourself" superior to it, unless you really are so. Simply to pretend to yourself that you are in this blessed condition, in which we all hope, some day, to be, is of no more use than to make the same pretence to others, and is even more harmful to spiritual health.

She gives what looks like good spiritual advice before ending the chapter, saying: "You must control

evil thoughts in the first place or they will control you in the second." But it is rather spoiled by what she says a little later; that "evil thoughts and aims reach no farther and do no more harm than anyone's belief permits." What belief has to do with the matter is not clear to persons unlearned in Eddian Science. Those who are learned in real spiritual science would, for "belief," substitute "will."

She gives, however, the following very good advice with regard to the education of children: "The teachers of schools and the readers in churches should be selected with as direct reference to their morals as to their learning or their correct reading." (This is all right, except that it is not the general practice, as yet, to have readers in churches, other than their regular pastors; but if there are to be readers, who are simply to read passages of Scripture or of Mrs. Eddy's substitute for it, the only matter of much importance would seem to be that they should know how to read them correctly.)

But she hits the nail squarely on the head, when she says that "school examinations are one-sided; it is not so much academic education, as a moral and spiritual culture, which lifts one higher." This is just what Christians in general have been saying for a long time. The only thing that we want to be sure of is that the culture is really and genuinely moral and spiritual.

One little "gem," which she gives us a few pages later, is worth quoting. She tells us of a woman who, "disappointed in love in her early years, became insane and lost all account of time." It appears, however, that her insanity made her fail to realize that the lover could not now be expected to turn up; and as

she had lost all account of the time during which he had not done so, she had a constant state of agreeable expectation that he would appear, at any and every moment, and so did not worry about him at all. She actually, as we are told, looked the same when seventy-four years old as she did in youth. Well, of course this was rather extraordinary; but it may be conceded that such an unusual thing might happen, and the explanation she gives of it is not so bad. As Mrs. Eddy wisely remarks "impossibilities never occur." "One instance like the foregoing," she says, "proves it possible to be young at seventy-four."

But now notice the sudden leap which she makes from the possible to the regular or normal. "The primary (whatever that means) of that illustration makes it plain that decrepitude is not according to law." Common sense would say that it is plain from our regular or normal experience, that decrepitude *is,* in fact, according to law, and that this case which she produces was a very extraordinary exception.

"Never record ages," she says. "Chronological data are no part of the vast forever." Practically, for some purpose at any rate, this advice is quite good, and ladies (and gentlemen too) may prudently follow it.

She goes on to say: "Life is eternal. We should find this out, and begin the demonstration thereof." She carried out her own advice, and did *begin* the demonstration; but it so happened that she "lost the thread of her discourse." This sometimes is the case with demonstrations which really are good ones; so perhaps it was only an accident with her, after all.

She tells us that "men and women of riper years and larger lessons ought to ripen into health and im-

mortality, instead of lapsing into darkness and gloom." But if the author of the science which ought to produce glorious results did not succeed so well as lots of people who were quite ignorant of it, it does not seem to be a very convincing argument for that science.

Well, perhaps we may now be allowed to pass on to her next chapter, which would seem from its title, to be getting somewhat nearer to the real issues involved in her remarkable theories. It is called

CHAPTER IX.

Creation.

Instead of tackling at once, as we might expect, the usual or orthodox ideas about creation, and showing the superiority of her own, Mrs. Eddy starts out in it by a sort of vague discussion of the Christian dogma of the Incarnation, which seems to be rather irrelevant. In this she gives a little slap, by the way as it were, at that of the Holy Trinity. On this last she does not spend much ink or time. She contents herself by saying: "The theory of three persons in one God (that is, a personal Trinity or Tri-unity) suggests polytheism; rather than the one ever-present *I Am*. 'Hear Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord.'"

This one little slap or snap she seems to think quite enough to dispose at once of the arguments made long ago by the greatest minds of the time (and indeed of all time) to show that the dogma of the Trinity does *not* mean polytheism. "It suggests polytheism," she says, "at any rate it suggests it to me, and of course no one can see anything else in it, if I don't."

She evidently has no idea or knowledge whatever of the profound examinations of the dogma made for several centuries by St. Athanasius and the other great Doctors of the Church against Arius and his partisans; in which incomparably more ability was shown on both sides of the question than poor Mrs. Eddy could ever by any possibility have had. If she had said: "I, though a comparatively ignorant person, have received a special revelation, showing to me, and to the world through me, that this dogma of the Trinity, so long held by the immense majority in the Church, is erroneous," she might have had something to rest on. She might have been asked to give some evidence to prove the fact of her revelation, but that might have been managed well enough to satisfy a good many. But no; this little snap is all that she deems necessary.

She does, however, condescend to go on to show that no one appearing to be a man like others, could possibly have been God. "The everlasting *I Am,*" she says, "is not bounded nor compressed within the narrow limits of physical humanity." Again the notion into which she is prone to fall, that infinity is a matter of size, shows itself. She goes on: "Nor can He be understood aright through mortal concepts." We quite agree with this last. But probably an exception would have to be made in favor of Mrs. Eddy, as she was thoroughly imbued with "immortal Mind," and had shaken off the false notions of mortal mind (with a small "m"). But as to the everlasting I Am not being "bounded or compressed within the narrow limits of physical humanity," no one who believes in the Incarnation ever entertains any such idea; nor would she, if she could stop thinking of infinity as being a matter of size.

The fact is, as she sees well enough, that this is a matter which cannot be "understood aright through mortal concepts;" especially by any to which she has been accustomed. But she has nothing to offer in place of these. It seems to her that if a spirit of any kind is to be put into a body, the body must be fitted to it, as a coat is to a man. This is conceivable, and perhaps she regards it as our regular "concept" of the matter. "But," she would say, "God is infinitely too large for anything like that to be possible. No material body could be big enough for Him. So," she would tell us, "the Incarnation, or Divinity of Christ, as taught by Christians, must be rejected."

Well, she can of course reject it, if she chooses. But she cannot very well deny that Our Lord said words about Himself which seem to be a plain statement of it. On one occasion, as St. John tells us in his Gospel, He said to the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day; and he saw it, and was glad. Then said the Jews unto Him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, *I Am*." There are other passages, of course, in which He is recorded as asserting His own Divinity; but this seems specially appropriate, as in it He uses the very words which, as Mrs. Eddy has just insisted, cannot be applied to anything bounded or compressed "within the narrow limits of physical humanity."

She goes on, in her following words, to reassert her denial. "No form or physical combination," she says, "is adequate to represent infinite Love. A finite and material sense of God leads to formalism and narrowness; it chills the spirit of Christianity. A limitless

mind cannot proceed from physical limitations. Finiteness cannot present the idea of the vastness of infinity. A mind originating from a finite or material source must be limited and finite."

In all this, we see her idea of infinity, as a matter of infinite size or dimension, continually cropping out; and also the notion of "a mind originating from a finite or material sense," which is not held by any orthodox Christian, if indeed it is by anyone at all.

She cannot, it would seem, shake off this strange notion that our usual belief is that one mind produces another. "The theory," she goes on to inform us, "that Spirit is not the only substance and creator is pantheistic heterodoxy." This certainly is rather mixing things up. The first part (that about substance) would only mean that there are other substances created by the Almighty, which are not identical with Himself. We don't see, nor can anyone, how she makes this out to be pantheistic; it would seem to be quite the contrary. But that there are other "creators" no Christian admits for a moment, and we have never heard of anyone that did. The old straw man again.

Mrs. Eddy simply has a habit of slinging words about without attaching any definite meaning to them. She would seem to be gradually getting at the idea of what she understands by the word "creation." Let us try to find out if she has any. Properly, it means, of course, the causing something to exist which did not exist before. But with her it seems to mean a reflection or representation of what has always existed. "Man," she tells us, "is not absorbed in Deity, and man cannot lose his individuality, for he reflects eternal Life; nor is he an isolated, solitary idea, for

he represents infinite Mind, the sum of all substance." Astonishing as it may seem, and as it really is, this is about the nearest approach to anything about "creation," in this chapter, which one naturally expects to explain what Mrs. Eddy understands by this very important word.

A few pages further on in it, indeed, she makes her usual style of remark, as follows: "The creations of mortal mind are material. Immortal spiritual man alone represents the truth of creation." But this does not tell us how "immortal spiritual man" came into existence. He was not, it would seem, himself "the truth of creation," which we might suppose to mean "truly created," if it means anything at all. No, he only "represented the truth of creation."

She says, a little later, "there can be but one creator, who has created all." But she does not deign to tell us what she means by a creator, or by creating, or what is the "all" that this creator has created. "Immortal spiritual man" is not this "all," but only represents it, as we have just seen; and she has previously said that he represents "infinite Mind," and that can't have been created.

If there is any idea at all that can be got out of this mass of confusion, it would seem to be that man ("immortal spiritual man" of course) has always existed and is a reflection of eternal Life or God. The nearest idea to this is that of the eternal Word, or Son of God, the second Person of the Blessed Trinity, Who, as we Christians believe, became Incarnate in a human soul and body. But she can't be referring to Him, or she would speak more plainly. And she doesn't believe in the Incarnation at all, as she has given us to understand very distinctly.

As to "matter," of course, that can't be any part of the "all" which the creator has created. In fact she has said, just above as quoted, that "the creations of mortal mind are material," which really means that the material universe is a "creation," figment, or delusion of mortal mind, as she has told us before.

What, then, is the real creation? We can't find it anywhere. And what in the world is she talking about? It is quite safe to say that she herself had not the remotest idea. Only, an unmeaning word fits even better into her strings of unmeaning words, than it would if it had some definite sense of signification.

It is time to stop merely laughing at the confusion of ideas under which this poor woman labored, and talk very seriously. It really seems that she sometimes is simply lying; trying to deliberately deceive her readers, when she continually repeats false charges as to what Christians in general hold and teach, and claims the credit of it all to her own groundless notions, as in the following passage: "Mortals," she says, "when the supposed pain and pleasure of matter cease to predominate, will drop the false estimate of life and happiness, of joy and sorrow, and attain the bliss of loving unselfishly, working patiently, and conquering all that is unlike God." By this, she plainly means to assert that what she describes was never done and could not be done, without her false principles of Eddian Science; whereas it has been the daily life of all true Christians, ages before she was born, and practised continually by them much better than she ever even imagined.

There is no chapter in her book in which it is more evident—as it is here—that what is true in it is not

new, as we remarked in our preface. She says, for instance, in this chapter: "If one turns away from the body with such absorbed interest as to forget it, the body experiences no pain." Everyone knows that a great deal can be accomplished in this way. At times of intense intellectual occupation, the pleasures of the senses cease to allure, and unless bodily pains are so great as to prevent absolutely such occupation, the mind ceases to pay much attention to them. The same may be said of a strong desire or turning the will in some other direction. In trying, for instance, to extinguish a dangerous fire, one may be quite severely burned without being aware of it till the peril is over. And this distraction of the mind from the lower by its fixing on the higher may rise to heroic degrees when (usually by special Divine help) the supernatural rather than the merely natural comes into play; as in the case of St. Lawrence on the gridiron, or of many of the martyrs; or in the ecstasies of the saints.

But there is no need to account for this by bringing in Eddian theories that there is no reality in matter, or that it is only "an error of mortal mind," any more than there is to conclude that a bore, who tires you by his conversation, and tries to force it on you, has no real existence, or is only an "error." The mind simply escapes from him, if bodily escape is not possible, to fix itself on something of more interest. You would be glad, perhaps, if he did not exist, but you know, only too well, that he does. You simply minimize him, as much as possible.

So we may proceed on these minimizing lines with this chapter, in which there is so little that really requires attention. We were very sanguine in entering

on it; as when in boyhood we had ice-cream in a wineglass, and thought that when the "froth," piled up on the top (which really was the whole thing) was disposed of, we would come to the solid part. So we have a similar experience here. In this promising chapter about "Creation," we find next to nothing on that subject at all; all froth.

The next one seems even more solid, by its title; but we have grave misgivings about it, now. It is called

CHAPTER X.

Science of Being.

This title does look as if we were here to have something really scientific, at last. "Science of Being!" A treatise on "Ontology," or something of the kind. (How was it that Mrs. Eddy never got hold of this word? She could have had great fun with it.) But any such expectations will be soon dispelled. Indeed they were unreasonable from the start. For how could anyone write on something of which he had never heard even the name?

As we begin to look into this chapter, the first thing we notice is our old friend the straw man, poking out his head more continually than ever before. His first appearance is an unusually startling one. He appears now in the guise of "belief in a material basis from which may be deduced all rationality." We are told, it is true, that he is now "slowly yielding to the idea of a metaphysical basis," which, we are informed, "looks away from matter to Mind as the cause of every effect;" but he seems to be quite lively still. "Materialistic hypotheses challenge meta-

physics to meet in mortal combat," Mrs. Eddy says. "In this revolutionary period," she continues, "like the herd-boy with his sling, woman (Mrs. Eddy, that is) goes forth to battle with Goliath."

She seems really to have got this "materialism" on the brain, as it were, and thinks that everyone else has it as well; and that there is no one fighting it except herself.

Imagine a person writing stuff like this: "The theories I combat are these: 1. That all is matter; 2. That matter originates in Mind, and is as real as Mind, possessing intelligence and life. The first theory, that matter is everything, is quite as reasonable as the second, that Mind and matter coexist and coöperate. One only of the following statements can be true: 1. That everything is matter; 2. That everything is Mind. Which one is it?"

Imagine a person going out as Mrs. Eddy valiantly does with her "sling," and slinging around such logic as this!

There is only one of these statements that any Christian admits, and that is, that "matter originates in Mind." It is not, in a very true sense of the word, as *real* as Mind, for it does not *necessarily* exist, as indeed the statement just preceding, that it "originates" in Mind, clearly shows. Still less does it follow that it "possesses intelligence and life."

The reason, of course, for her trying to force on us these two theories given as the only possible ones different from her own, is that she determines to ignore the regular Christian teaching, that matter is *created;* which means, created out of nothing. She simply does not mention this even as a "theory," at all; she chooses to take for granted that no one can

possibly hold it. She has just written a chapter, nominally about "Creation," in which she omits to say anything about the subject of the chapter.

If she would make some objection to this point of Christian belief, no one could complain. But she does not even seem to understand it in any way. So we shall have to state it for her, or rather for her followers, who are inclined to swallow everything that she gives them to swallow. The Christian belief is then as follows:

1. Nothing exists, necessarily or from eternity, except God, Whom she chooses to call "Mind." He can, however, call into existence anything which He pleases; but even He cannot make any such thing to be necessary or eternal as He Himself is; for He being omnipotent, must necessarily reserve to Himself the power to destroy it.

2. There was a "time," as we have to say (for we have no other word for it) when nothing did exist except God. But, properly speaking, it was not "time" at all. For "time" properly means a *succession* of events. And in Him there is no such succession. God Himself, His own Life, is absolutely independent of time.

3. This is a profound mystery, which human reason can never thoroughly comprehend. But it follows, logically, from what we are able to know by the faculties which He has given us. For we know, by our own consciousness, that in us there is a succession of events and we see the same all around us. But this succession must have had a beginning. And it simply could not start of itself. It could only begin in some Being independent of time, in Whom there is no succession, whose Life is one eternal *Now*. That is to

say, of course, in Him, for whose Life the only word is *I Am*.

Mrs. Eddy's fundamental mistake is in not being willing to acknowledge this ineffable mystery, which it is vain for us to try to sound. She sees well enough that matter could not always have existed; but she refuses to believe that it ever could have begun to exist. So she simply concludes that it does not now exist, and will not take any evidence to show that it does.

With regard to what she calls "mortal mind," she is really puzzled. For she knows, by her own consciousness, that this does exist. And she is afraid to confess that it can have been created out of nothing, for if it could have been, why not matter as well? So there is, or seems to her to be, no other course except to hold that whatever there is of reality in it, is identical with "Mind" or the Being of God Himself. In other words, she is convinced that she herself is God. There would be no trouble about this, except that other people have also to be accounted for, to make her conclusions of any practical service. So unless their existence, like that of matter, is absolutely to be denied, they must be God, as well as she.

This being the case, of course there can be nothing really imperfect, or not in good working order in anybody else, any more than with herself. If there seems to be, it must be a delusion, or illusion of "mortal mind." But how in the world can there be any illusion in God? Yet, if she once admits that she (and other people) are not God, the whole business falls to pieces.

Of course, there is nothing for her to do but to dodge this difficulty, and say nothing about it; and

talk loudly and continually about "materialism," and try to ascribe to her opponents' false beliefs about matter, as for example, that it "possesses intelligence and life." Some people, perhaps, may have such beliefs and that is quite sufficient for her purpose. She may be as pantheistic as she likes, if she can only have it believed that her opponents are so, and that she, of course, since she is slinging (not a stone, but mud) at them, must be different.

It is a pity that she does not seem to have had exactly the soil of "an honest and good heart" of which she speaks later, in which to sow her own doctrines, to begin with. This defect makes her constantly assume that it is "chastity and purity, in contrast with the earthward gravitation of sensualism and impurity, which really attest the divine origin and operation of Christian Science." This is, practically, to assert that her Eddian Science is only opposed by those who are controlled by "sensualism and impurity."

Of course she goes on firing occasionally at "material hypotheses" all through this chapter, as usual, hoping, as it would seem, to make so much smoke as to hide the actual issues. We can just take these samples, all on one page. "Deductions from material hypotheses are not scientific." "Divine Science reverses the false testimony of the material senses." "Science shows that material, conflicting mortal opinions emit the effects of error at all times." "God never ordained a material law to annul the spiritual law." As if anyone ever pretended that He did! Or again, on the next page, she speaks of the five senses as being "the manifested beliefs of mortal mind, which affirm that life, substance, and intelligence are

material, instead of spiritual. Of course they don't affirm anything of the kind. The danger to those not instructed in real religion, and particularly evident in this chapter, is in the pious sound of much of the talk in which she indulges. For example: "The starting point of divine Science is that God, Spirit, is All-in-all, and that there is no other might nor Mind—that God is Love, and that therefore He is divine Principle."

Of course these last words mean nothing whatever. But they sound nice, and give her a chance to lug in her favorite word "Principle." She then goes on: "To grasp the reality and order of being in its Science, you must begin by reckoning God as the divine Principle of all that really is. (As if any Christian failed to do that!) "Spirit, Life, Truth, Love, combine as one—and are the Scriptural names for God. All substance, intelligence, wisdom, being, immortality, cause and effect belong to God." "These are His attributes, the eternal manifestations of the infinite divine Principle, Love. No wisdom is wise but His wisdom; no truth is true, no love is lovely, no life is Life but the divine; no good is, but the good God bestows." This, of course, is quite right; it is quite theologically sound, if taken widely, and might be put into any good spiritual book. It really has a good deal of what we call "unction" about it. But the amazing thing is that Mrs. Eddy should try to palm it off as her own discovery, and a part of her new Eddian Science, when in fact it has been said over and over again in all the ages of Christianity. It has no connection at all with her peculiar ideas.

A couple of pages later on, she falls into a strange mistake which ought to be evident, even to her own

bewildered mind. She tells us that matter is a "human concept." So far is this from being the case, that the human mind not only cannot thoroughly understand it; it cannot of itself make any concept of it at all. We have already had occasion to refer to this; but it will do no harm to repeat it. Mind is intelligible to us; for we ourselves are in its region or domain. Matter on the other hand is not intelligible, to us directly, and we probably might never be able to get any idea of it if God had not mysteriously revealed it to us through the senses. It even seems likely, that, if we were entirely deprived of these physical senses, which God has given to us, we should never be able to get any idea even of the geometrical space in which matter lies or moves. We cannot, experimentally, be quite sure as to this, for even in the cases of such of us who have never had those of sight and hearing, or have at any rate lost them at a very early age, and in whom those of smell and taste are much dulled, that of touch has to a considerable extent remained; so that we cannot have any certain test to go by.

Of course He Who is the Creator of both spirit and matter could have bridged the gap between the two by some other means beside that of the senses; but we cannot even imagine what that means could have been. Not can we imagine what sort of knowledge the angels which He has created (or any other incorporeal spirits which He may have created) can have of matter or even of space. It certainly seems that Mrs. Eddy, if she wanted, for her purpose, to deny the existence of matter, would have done much better by following this line than that of calling matter a "human concept," which is precisely what it is

not. The reason why the rest of us, who may be called "sensible" people, do not follow it, is that we are sure that God, Who can neither deceive nor be deceived, would not have given us up by our senses to a delusion, and compelled us to believe in what really does not exist.

It would be absolutely impossible for "mortal mind" to invent matter if there were none; it may be called a revelation from God to us. And as it is so, we rightly say, in accordance with all sound philosophy, that the senses are an infallible motive of certitude; though of course they may occasionally work abnormally, so that nothing exterior to our own organism is the cause of the impressions which we receive from them. Mrs. Eddy, however, has no difficulty, in pronouncing, by her complete and infallible knowledge of all the things of God, that He never could have created matter.

"Is Spirit," she asks, "the source or creator of matter?" "Science," she has the audacity to say, "reveals nothing in Spirit out of which to create matter." She does not, as has often already been remarked, recognize at all what is meant by "creation." Spirit needs nothing "out of which" to create matter. If she chooses to say, that even for God creation out of nothing is impossible, very well; that is the only line to take, and it has already been taken by others. But she should not, disingenuously, assume that if God created it, He must create it "out of" something previously existing, and thus set limits to the Almighty.

What she goes on to say is simply not true. "The admission," she says, "that there can be material substance requires another admission—namely, that

Spirit is not infinite, and that matter is self-creative, self-existent, and eternal." It requires nothing of the sort. It simply requires the admission that Spirit *is* infinite, not that It is *not* so. But she is, as it would seem, hopelessly befogged by her idea of infinity as a matter of quantity, from which it appears to her that if God created anything He would be bigger than He was before; as if the manifestation of His power and glory made any difference in Himself.

This subject, however, is too great a one to be properly discussed in a book like this. If Mrs. Eddy had wished to go into it thoroughly, she should have read the profound and exhaustive treatises on it to be found in regular and professional theological works, instead of just flipping it aside in a page or two; and her "students" should follow that course now. To assume that she knew, and others by her can know, all about it is a case of "fools rushing in where angels fear to tread."

The difficulty which in fact she finds, but tries to cover up by a maze of words, is to explain how, if God is "All-in-all" in her sense of the term, "error" comes in, in any way. If she would admit that He could create substance not perfectly possessing His own attributes (which is what is meant by creation) this difficulty would disappear. This difficulty we have already remarked.

The whole trouble is caused by the one purpose which is the *raison d'etre,* as the French would say, of her whole system, which is of course to "cure the sick." She vainly struggles to get rid of it by saying that matter and its effects—sin, sickness, and death—are states of mortal mind, which act, react, and come to a stop. They are not facts of Mind.

But what is mortal mind, to have these "states?" Please step up to the Captain's office and settle. God can't have created it, for Mrs. Eddy says that He can't create anything. And she also rightly says that nothing can create itself. After all, then, "mortal mind" must be the same as "Mind." How, then, do its states "act, react, and then come to a stop?" There seems to be only one answer to this. They are not *facts* of "Mind," but just *states* of "Mind." Anyone ought to see the difference between "facts" and "state." Of course she doesn't mean this, for she doesn't mean anything at all. But she has to say something. If she stops talking she is done for.

It is about time now to bring more to the front a very important matter, which is among those just mentioned, but which we have not yet paid much attention to, in this examination of "Eddian Science." The inventor of this pseudo-science does not say much about it herself, and indeed it seems that she tries to pass it over as of not much consequence. But it is really not only a very important matter, but by far the most important one, practically, that we can have to discuss.

Mrs. Eddy simply mentions it in the passage just now quoted, as being one of the "effects" of matter, which she says are "sin, sickness and death." She names it first, but in her estimate it seems to be last. It is the worst thing in the world, and is not one of the "effects of matter," which is created by God, and of course in itself good. "Sickness and death," also, are effects of it, not of "matter," as she would have us believe. We hardly need to say that this worst thing of all in the world is "sin."

The genuine Christian Science, revealed to us by

our faith, teaches us that in fact sin did not have its origin in matter, in any way at all. The first sin was committed by beings who were not associated with matter, and were purely spiritual. These were the angels of God. These, as the apostle St. Jude (whom Mrs. Eddy has to number among the first students of Christian Science) tells us were the ones whose evil example mankind has followed. That is to say, some of them were; the rest remaining in justice or righteousness and obedience, and being therefore confirmed in that happy state forever. The Apostle's words are the following: "The angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, He hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." (We quote this from the version with which Mrs. Eddy was familiar, though all are substantially the same.)

As to to our following their example, St. Paul explicitly tells us: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into this world, and death by sin." (Her own version again.) Rom. v. 12. This one man was the first man, Adam. St. Paul could not possibly have meant to refer to any other.

Now what was this first sin, both of the angels and of man? It had, of course, with the angels, nothing to do with matter at all. And even Mrs. Eddy herself does not, in her fragmentary "*Key,*" or elsewhere, consider it as caused in man by a merely gluttonous desire for a material apple. But even if she did, we do not need information from her, for the Scripture is plain. The sin of the angels, and also of man, was obviously one of disobedience and pride, of setting up the judgment or opinion of a creature against that of the Creator. It might have

been committed by man if matter really had no existence whatever. The temptation was, as the Scripture tells us, that if Adam and Eve would disobey God's commands, they should "be as gods, knowing good and evil." It was a spiritual temptation. The result leading of yielding to it was, that matter, which was created for good, became an occasion of evil to man, and the Divine Principle (as Mrs. Eddy would say) of obedience to God ceased to be his sole control.

The truth is that sickness and death are the effects of sin; sin itself is the original cause of our evils. Sin must not be lumped together with sickness and death, as one of the effects of matter. Matter, having been perverted for us by sin from its original good purpose, may now be a cause or occasion for sin; and it actually is so for most of the sins committed by mankind. But to put the blame for sin on matter, as if the latter were something essentially bad, is simply to put, as Mrs. Eddy so often does, the cart before the horse. And it is the reason, of course, why she tries to deny, against the senses which God has given to us, and against common sense, the existence of matter. She does not really disbelieve in its existence, as her words frequently show; but it seems to her that she has to deny it, on account of her false principles; and so she involves herself in her continual contradictions. The worst of all this, of course, is that it relieves us of all responsibility for sin. Sin, instead of being, as it really is, an error which we can avoid by our will, aided by the grace of God, becomes simply a mistake, due to a lack of understanding of some propositions of hers, which no one can really understand as true.

This fatal Eddian error is more or less prevalent at the present day, not only among those who formally accept her doctrine which leads to it, but also in the world at large. Mankind are always only too ready to make for themselves an excuse for sin, and still readier to take one, if it is offered to them. And they are all the more ready to do so, if the excuse is also presented to them as a positive remedy for other evils which most of them care more than for sin itself, namely, "sickness and death." And still more so, if by means of a general acceptance of it, they can be saved from the consequences which human justice has assigned as penalties for sin, when it takes the form of crime; as is shown to be actually the case by the increasing frequency of the plea of "insanity."

We do not, of course, mean to say that this last motive is prominent or usual among actual Christian Scientists. They are not, yet, quite enough of them for it to be so; and most of them are fairly well protected by circumstances from criminal tendencies. But it is evident that if "Christian Science" became the prevailing doctrine of any community, those who were not so protected would be glad to avail themselves of it.

And with regard to sins which are not crimes against the law, it is evident that they cannot be so efficaciously or strongly resisted if they are believed to be simply symptoms of a general disease causing sickness and death, which can be otherwise overcome, as they would be if they were regarded as in themselves, and individually, culpable.

Mrs. Eddy, it is true, claims and directs that what she calls "false beliefs" should be resisted as promptly and energetically as good Christians resist what we

call "bad thoughts;" but it is hardly possible for those to act in this way who only look on them as remotely and slightly injurious, instead of being directly and dangerously so.

The remainder of this chapter, and like most of what has already been gone over, contains nothing new. Perhaps the most noteworthy feature in it is the continual repetition of the accusation that orthodox Christians believe that the Infinite starts from the finite. Mrs. Eddy really must know that they do not so believe; but she not only constantly asserts this false charge, but even takes its truth for granted. Of course all Christians who know anything at all about their religion know that it is false, just as well as she knew it herself. But she hoped that those who are not very well instructed can be induced to take her word for it, especially if it is repeated often enough, even without any attempt to give facts or quotations to establish the charge. It may be as well just to notice one more example of this sort of thing from this chapter.

"If God," she says, "were limited to man or matter, or if the infinite could be circumscribed within the finite, God would be corporeal and infinite Mind would seem to spring from a limited body; but this is an impossibility. Infinite Mind can have no starting point, and can return to no limit. It can never be in bonds, nor be fully manifested through corporeality."

It is true that she does not say directly that anybody actually makes the statements which she is attacking; but she feels quite sure that her readers will think that some one must have made them, and in fact that there must be many of the "unscientific"

who hold them to be true. Many, she thought, will believe on her word, that the ordinary Christian really believes that God "is limited to man or matter," and that the infinite "can be circumscribed within the finite;" that God is, in fact, corporeal, and that unlimited Mind "springs from a limited body;" that infinite Mind has a starting point, and returns to a limit. Or, if they don't believe these latter propositions, which she deduces from the former ones (though they are all the same), it is because they are too stupid to see the connection. And also that the ordinary Christian thinks that God is "in bonds, and is fully manifested through corporeality."

This one paragraph alone ought to be enough to stamp her as a falsifier and a liar; for though she did not know very much about religion of any kind except the false and absurd system which she tried to palm off on the world, she did know well enough that nobody whatever holds any of these things, whether premises or conclusions, which she tries to make her readers believe that practically everybody except herself and her "students" hold.

We are sorry to have to speak in this way about anyone who is commonly regarded, outside of her own circle, as simply under a kind of harmless delusion; but really one cannot regard this sort of thing as merely a case of what we have called the "straw man." And there are plenty of examples of it all through her book. We can hardly expect that those who have become her "students," and learned to pay a sort of worship to her as superior to our Divine Lord Himself, will be rescued from her by anything that we or anyone else can say; but we do venture to hope that some of those who have not

seen through her may be warned against her while there is yet time.

A few pages further on, she actually has the audacity to quote Our Lord's own words, "I and My Father are one," which the immense majority of Christians have always taken as an assertion of His Divinity, as a proof that everyone of us has a right to say the same. She explains these words as showing that "he knew of but one Mind, and laid no claim to any other. He knew that the Ego (and of course that of everyone else) was Mind instead of body and that matter, sin and evil were not Mind." And she pretends that it was "His understanding of this divine Science" which "brought upon Him the anathemas of the age." As if it would have worried the Jews at all to have Him claim to be a "reflection," as she calls it, of "Mind," if He allowed them to be the same!

One cannot help wondering whether Mrs. Eddy's deluded followers have ever read any considerable portion of her book. It is especially remarkable, if they have done so, how they can possibly continue to cling to it, after the complete dissipation of its absurd notions by her own inglorious departure from this world. And one can hardly understand why she ventured to write passages which evidently implied that she herself, at any rate, was not to be subject to death, when she must have known that there was no real reason why she should not die, like other people.

For instance, she says in this chapter which we are now wading through, that "the belief of that mortal that he must die occasioned his departure." And again, she says that "mortals claim that death is inevitable." What was the sense of knocking her

own nonsense in the head by maintaining that a true Christian Scientist can avoid death if he only refuses to believe he has to die, when she knew that she would stamp herself as not a genuine Scientist by actually dying?

There is really only one answer to this question, for it is almost incredible that she was under the delusion that she would live forever. And that answer is that all that she really cared for was to make some money by selling her book at an exorbitant price, far above any possible expense incurred in producing it; and that she felt sure that during her life, people would be willing to pay this price on account of the false promises held out to them in it. She quite reasonably thought that a good many people would be foolish enough to take some stock in these promises, and that while she lived she could have a life, which even if it should happen to be short, would certainly be a merry one. But it is pretty safe to say that she did not expect that they would go so far as to continue believing in those promises after she herself, by dying, exploded them. And how it is that they actually do so continue, is an inscrutable mystery.

Her own idea was "after me, the deluge," but she did not care an atom about that. She was perfectly willing, not only to sacrifice all posthumous fame, but also to do all the injury that she could to the souls, and even to the bodies of her "students," and to take her chance of incurring the judgments of God for this, after her own death, so long as she could get some money out of them while she lived.

Well, a good many people, indeed the great majority of mankind, have always acted in the same way.

"The children of this world," Our Lord has told us, are wiser in their generation than the children of light." Mrs. Eddy simply was in their class. She probably did not even believe in God or His judgments at all.

It is interesting, however, to observe how she tries to lay a sort of anchor to windward to lessen the shock and strain of the catastrophe which she expected to come. Of course she regards the death of our Blessed Lord on the cross as not having occurred at all. "To show," she says, "that the substance of Himself was Spirit, and the body was more perfect because of death, and no less material until the Ascension (His further spiritual exultation) Jesus waited until the mortal or fleshy sense had relinquished the belief of substance-matter, and spiritual sense had quenched all earthly yearnings. Thus He found the eternal Ego, and proved that He and the Father were inseparable as God and His reflection or spiritual man. Our Master gained the solution of being, demonstrating the existence of but one Mind without a second or equal."

Of course, Mrs. Eddy gained the "solution of being" with less difficulty than "our Master" did, for she got at it before going through the formality of death at all. For she wrote this chapter on the "Science of Being" (which we suppose includes its "solution") long before going through any such formality; and why "our Master" should have needed it is not quite clear. Still less (according to her own relative estimate of herself and Himself) is it clear why she should have to have gone through it; but of course as it had to come, there had to be some explanation for it.

So she gets up this ingenious scheme. "Our Master," she tells us, did not really depart until the belief in substance—matter was relinquished by Him, and even then, it could not be called death. The mistake of supposing that He had a body was got over, in His case, by the disappearance of that body in the clouds of the Ascension. Of course Mrs. Eddy knew that she could not get up anything like that for herself. A balloon (aëroplanes were not practically a success at the time) would be rather too "thin" as an expedient; moreover, she would not have trusted herself, at any rate without a skilled aëronaut, in a balloon. And then there would have been the difficulty about where to come down (to say nothing about the chance of coming down too rapidly), or about disposing of the necessary aëronaut. He might be killed and buried, of course; but then where was she to live without her substance-matter being discovered?

She saw that a much better way than this balloon idea would be, when the time really came for her to die, to have her "substance-matter" safely boxed up in concrete. This would practically make it disappear as well as ascending into the clouds would, if precautions were taken not to have the concrete broken; in this way it could be alleged that it was all a mistake that she had died like other people. On the contrary, her not believing in substance-matter would have resulted in a triumph. It would make other people not believe in it, in her case at any rate. For who could prove the contrary? Her "students" could say that "her mortal or fleshly sense finally relinquished the belief of substance-matter, and spiritual sense had quenched all earthly yearnings,"

in her, and indeed in all of her disciples, as far as she was concerned.

And the shallow trick actually worked, surprising as it may seem that it should do so. It was only a kind of last resort, for which she probably did not seriously expect success, but thought that it might be worth trying. Human credulity proved to be a more potent factor than even she, who had worked on it with great success for so long, ever realized.

It would seem that enough has been said, and enough quotations have been made of actual passages in her book, to show the falsity of the doctrines on which it rests. It is, indeed, probable enough that she did not actually write the book herself, but got some one else to write it for her. But even if this is the fact, it makes no difference. This book, whoever may have written it, is the authorized expression of the false system which she has been the means of introducing, and her approval of it makes her as thoroughly responsible for it as if it had proceeded from her own pen; and justifies any personal blame we have imputed to her for it. And this blame, of course, is all the greater, because she unquestionably gave it out, or allowed it to be given out, as a "revelation" granted to her from above. If she had merely published it as the expression of her own opinions, it might, of course, have done some harm, but by no means so much; but she had the audacity to allow herself to be put on the throne of God Himself, and to be Divinely commissioned to speak for Him. Of course she knew that this was the only way to get a big sale for it; but that is evidently no excuse, but makes it a greater fault by far, than it would be if she had, like other authors of false theologies or

philosophies, merely given it out as her own interpretation of what was indicated by reason, or as what was agreed on by those to whom it was addressed as being really the Word of God, or the Bible.

Those who wish to bring into the world what they regard as new and valuable thoughts, are content, if they are honest, to trust that they will recommend themselves to sincere searchers for the truth. And it is such a pity for those who are deceived by her. For all that there is really valuable in the ideas which she endeavored to propagate is already fully expressed by sound Christian theology.

All orthodox Christians admit fully what she is constantly falsely pretending that they do not; that Spirit is the origin not only of all truth, but of all that exists. No one holds that matter is in any way independent of its Creator; or that it originates anything whatever, simply by its own power. And we all are perfectly sure that it can be destroyed entirely by Him at any moment that He may choose.

There is no necessity whatever for holding that it has no actual existence; still less, if there could be less than none, for limiting the power of the Almighty by maintaining that it would be impossible for Him to create it, or anything else. And with regard to the one point which seems to be of any interest to Mrs. Eddy or her "students," no Christian supposes for a moment that "drugs" or human contrivances of any sort are absolutely necessary for the curing of disease. They are only needed, as food or drink are, for the sustaining of life. It is simply absurd to make a difference in this respect between food and medicine. Both are gifts of God, and intended by Him to be used in their regular and ap-

propriate way. Both may be used to excess; or both may be unduly neglected. With regard to food, Mrs. Eddy followed, and all her "scientific" followers undoubtedly now follow, the same lines that are followed by other people. No one believes, and she herself does not pretend, that she got along without it, or went without her regular meals; she did not put out any theory that a piece of buttered toast, or a cup of tea, had no real existence, and that there was no use in partaking of either when one felt hungry or thirsty. Indeed she expressly reprobates asceticism of any kind.

The common sense of the matter is, that food is necessary for the human machine in its regular working; medicine only when the working gets irregular. Or, in other words, the care of the body is like that of a watch; when it is going right all one has to do is to wind it regularly; when it is out of order in any way, one has to regulate the balance-wheel, or put on a new hand, if one of them comes off, or a new spring, if one is broken. The only difficulty which we meet with practically in the treatment of the body, is that we can't find out so well as we can with a watch, just what it is that has gone wrong; and that even if we do, we can't tell just how to make it go right. Of course this is the reason why doctors, who know more than others about its construction, are needed even more than watchmakers are for mending a watch. It is all just a matter of common sense, and nobody (not even Mrs. Eddy) who has a bit of that valuable quality throws it overboard when watches are concerned. But when it is a question of the body, a far more complex machine than a watch, people will often jump at the first quack remedy offered

to them, instead of consulting one who ought to know; and will not, like the presumptuous Mrs. Eddy, get up a theory, without the slightest need for it, and against the plain evidence of common sense, that there is nothing in it going wrong, or that in fact there is nothing in it to go wrong, because there is nothing in it at all to go either right or wrong.

And in fact just the same holds good in the subject of the soul or spirit as in that of the body. Even Mrs. Eddy has to acknowledge that the soul, spirit or mind (whichever she pleases) does go wrong, and is not in harmony with the "Mind" to which she tries to reduce everything. She doesn't try to blame the body for this; indeed she can't; for she doesn't admit the existence of the latter. So she simply calls it "mortal mind," and lets it go at that. She has no apology or explanation for this fatal flaw in her system; for none is possible. If the existence of the body is an "error of mortal mind," well, "mortal mind" has gone wrong; it has not kept in harmony with "Mind;" that conclusion is unavoidable. "Mind," according to her, knows that there is no body; "mortal mind" maintains there is. The obvious need is that "mortal mind" has got to be cured of this. Indeed the curing of this error, sickness, or disease, in it is just the object of her book, and of her whole system.

But the question which naturally comes to our "mortal mind" about this is, why should not the body be allowed to have real existence also? If you are going to believe that "mortal mind" exists (as it must if it is to fall into "error"), why not let the body exist too? Why not honestly confess that you believe what common sense compels you to believe,

or rather to see and know as a fact, instead of giving out this nonsense about the non-existence of matter, which you don't really believe yourself, and have to forget as soon as you begin to talk practically about anything at all? For all the healing of the sick which you can accomplish by any such ideas can be accomplished just as well without them. And more, indeed, can be done if you try to put yourself in union with God's holy will and ask His aid, instead of pretending that there is no need to ask for it. The healing of the sick by the direct help of God (or "Mind" as, according to your fad, you call Him) can be done, and has been done right along, and is now done frequently, in His Church. We all have almost daily experience of these cures that you brag so much about. It is no new thing; it only seems new to you, because you do not know so well how to bring it about as we do. Why make a fool of yourself, teach nonsense, and throw away common sense, for no object and for no advantage?

There is one curious passage in this chapter on this subject which may be worth mentioning. It is as follows: "This understanding of man's power, when he is equipped by God, has sadly disappeared from Christian history. For centuries it has been dormant, a lost element of Christianity. Our missionaries carry the Bible to India, but can it be said that they explain it practically, when hundreds of persons die there annually from serpent bites. Understanding spiritual law, and knowing that there is no material law, Jesus said, 'These signs shall follow them that believe—they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them.'"

In this Mrs. Eddy appears to be trying to give the

impression that she was quite in the habit of taking up serpents, and getting no injury from them, and that the same can be easily done by any real Christian Scientist; whereas she knew very well that she had never ventured on anything of the kind; nor had she ever taken a dose of prussic acid to prove that the common idea that there was a material law, making the experiment a fatal one, was merely an illusion. But if her notion that there are no material laws were correct, there was no reason why she should not have made experiments of this kind, and no reason why they should not succeed. That they do not succeed is a conclusive argument against her whole theory; and that she did not try them is a clear proof that she herself did not believe in it.

The Christian view of the matter, of course, is that in fact there are material laws, which will work uniformly unless He Who has made these laws chooses to suspend them on some special occasion, or unless some force (which may be merely a natural one, like that of medicine) neutralizes their operation. This last is the usual case, as we all know. And we do not expect that the Lord will bring about any result other than the natural one, unless there is some exceptional reason for it, as there was in the case of St. Paul, when he shook off the viper, to show the Divine protection which they who were sent by Him to preach might well expect. It is not for us to determine when such reasons may exist. We are, however, quite sure that they are exceptional; that they cannot be depended on, as a rule. Our Lord Himself did not habitually take up serpents and have them bite Him, nor did He drink poisons regularly, instead of water or wine. Nor did He try dangerous experi-

ments of any kind, just to prove that for an advanced "student" like Himself they were not dangerous.

There is one very notable example that has been recorded, just to teach us, as it were, the errors of Eddyism. There is no need to give it in detail, for we all know it. It occurred in the temptation of Christ by Satan, who urged Our Lord to cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, because the angels would bear Him up. Satan would not need any such reason for a genuine Eddyite, if there were such a person. All he would have to say to such an one would be that "this notion of the material law of gravitation is an error of mortal mind; and since you have, by union with Mind, got over such errors, you will be quite safe. You need not think or worry about angels at all, for in fact there are not any; and even if there were you wouldn't need them."

Our Lord's actual reply to this Eddian temptation was, as we know: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." The word which we translate "tempt" is, in the Greek, *"ekpeiraseis,"* from which our word "experiment" is derived. So Christ's answer simply means that we must not try dangerous experiments with the Lord our God, to show that His natural laws do not hold. To try such experiments in order to prove such theories by them, when the facts are already known, is precisely the Eddian idea, to refuse medical treatment, is an actual case of its application.

One other little question may as well be again asked of Eddian "students." How is it, if these laws of matter are "errors of mortal mind," that their results, when there is nothing to interfere with them, are so remarkably accurate? Accuracy, and agreement of

fulfillment with prediction, are not the results we should expect from "error." How is it that a solar eclipse can be foretold within one or two seconds of time, by means of these laws, many years before it occurs?

Again we may repeat that the All-wise Mind is not going to bring in new forces to counteract the laws which He has established, still less to suspend or nullify them, unless there are good reasons for doing so. He is not going to subject them to the caprices of the mortal mind of Mrs. Eddy or anyone else. But He will depart from the regular course of the universe which He has created, when for His own glory, or even for our good, He sees fit to do so.

It is quite evident that when He said that "those who believe shall take up serpents, or drink any deadly thing," or "that they should lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover," it was not His intention that this should happen every time; for that would be simply to turn over His creation for us to fool with, on the mere condition that we believed that we had power and permission to take upon ourselves the management of it for Him.

It is really wonderful that there can be well-meaning people who do not see that this promise which Mrs. Eddy presents to them of curing all diseases, and of overcoming death itself by her "Science," is the identical one which the Scripture tells us was made by Satan to our first parents of obtaining eternal life by having their eyes opened so as to have the science or knowledge which God had chosen to reserve to Himself. "You shall not die the death," said Satan; and that is exactly what Mrs. Eddy says.

But it is not surprising that when such people be-

lieve this Satanic promise which she offers, they should lose, as Adam and Eve did, the union with God which was their right in the beginning, by the grace of Christ, Who had redeemed it for them; and that they should also lose even all desire to obtain it. No one tries to obtain what he imagines that he already possesses; and the Eddian idea is that you are united to Mind by simply saying that there is nothing else to be united to, and that in fact you are part of it, or a "reflection" of it already; that there is no sin in you, as well as no sickness. This indifference to sin is one of the salient features of this false "science." There is no need of prayer in it, in the usual sense of the word. If there seems to be any sin to trouble you, it is only part of this "error" about sickness and death. You don't need to pray about it, but only to absorb Mrs. Eddy's ideas more thoroughly, and it will cease to bother you. There is no repentance or purpose of amendment needed for it, any more than there would be for a toothache; both are merely imaginary, and all you have to do is to get over the imagination of them. And of course it is the same way, if you want to help others. You don't need to get them out of their sins, even if they think they have such, but only to make them stop thinking so. Just sit by them, and think over Mrs. Eddy's wonderful discoveries instead of these nonsensical sins, and encourage them to do the same. That may be tiresome, but if you succeed, it ought to be worth five dollars at any rate; and, strange as it may seem, there is nothing imaginary about that.

Mrs. Eddy acknowledges, it would seem, in this chapter, that she had not succeeded in walking on the water, or in raising the dead; but as to getting people out of

sin, that was so easy, on the principles just laid down, that there was no need to make any prolonged studies, or complicated experiments, on it. And it was not of much consequence, anyway. Sickness and death were the really important things to get rid of. Her ideas, as we easily see, were more advanced than those of the angel, who said to St. Joseph, "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins." Mrs. Eddy would have said to the angel, "Why don't you say 'their sicknesses' instead of 'their sins?'" Her idea, often plainly stated, is that He came to heal the sick, and show others how to do it; not to show His power or prove His mission for more important matters, but because it was in itself the most important of all.

But "our Master" Himself had an idea differing from that of Mrs. Eddy. (This was due, of course, to His being only an imperfect "student" of Eddian Science.) "*That you may know,*" He said to the people, "*that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins,* He saith to the sick of the palsy, I say to thee Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house" (Mark ii. 10, 11, and Luke v. 24).

If He had gone as deeply into the matter as Mrs. Eddy, He would have understood that the really important thing was to cure the illusion of the sick man that he was really sick; as to forgiving his sins, they consisted simply in his giving way to this illusion of thinking that his body actually existed. Or, if there were others, they were of little importance compared with this one, and would disappear of themselves if this one was got rid of.

We, however, and Christians in general, prefer, in our blindness, to take Our Lord's judgment of the

matter, rather than that of the illustrious founder of Eddian science; and to believe that sin or willful disobedience to God, is our great soul-sickness, and the reason for our bodily ailments, though they are not given to us in proportion to our own personal sins. If the latter are forgiven, we cannot, however, always expect that the ailments will be cured, for they may be blessings in disguise, by giving us the privilege of sharing in the great work which Christ our Saviour has taken on Himself of suffering for our sins. And it may well be that those who are most united to Him, and love most, will have the best share of this, if He sees that they are able to bear it. He asks of His chosen Apostles, the sons of Zebedee, who wished for the chief places in His Kingdom, "Can you drink the chalice that I shall drink? They say to Him, we can. He saith to them: My chalice indeed you shall drink; but to sit on My right or left hand, is not Mine to give to you, but to them for whom it is prepared by My Father" (Matt. xx. 22, 23). And why for others rather than for them? Simply because there were a few others who loved Him and were willing to suffer with Him, even more than they.

The martyrs who suffered, even to death, for Him are confessed by all Christians to be His chief favorites. But Mrs. Eddy's gospel is meant to show us how to escape from bodily suffering, the most common form of which is sickness and disease. And she even would encourage us to think that we can escape from death itself, if we thoroughly believe in this gospel, though it is probable that she did not believe in it herself to quite that extent. It is a gospel which human nature gladly accepts, and is,

of course, naturally an attractive one to all of us. But the only union with God which it offers is one which is only intellectual and requires no sacrifice, except a little "study," to attain it. It is a curious feature of it that though it dwells much on the truth that God is Love, she says comparatively little on our showing any love for Him by sacrificing anything else for Him. And His own Love is to be principally shown by sparing us any such sacrifice.

There is another remarkable feature in it, which of course must have been noticed by almost everyone. It is that she never seems to think of any other trouble which we meet with in life, except this one of bodily illness. And yet there are others which one would expect her to pay some attention to. Among them perhaps the most notable of all is that of poverty, about which people in general worry more than about anything else, and try hardest to avoid, and from which, in these modern days, the masses suffer continually more and more. One reason for her inattention to it may be that her gospel is not addressed to the poor; though that of Christ, by His own statement, was so (Matt. xi. 5, and many other places). And evidently, as a result of this, most of those who actually have accepted it are those in comfortable circumstances in this respect.

Another reason, it would seem, was that she could not quite make even herself to believe or pretend to believe that poverty is like sickness, merely an illusion of mortal mind. She knew that she could not make the poor believe, when they needed food or clothing, or money to procure these necessities, that their trouble could be got over by simply imagining that they had them. Indeed such imaginings would

probably only make their suffering greater. And yet one does not exactly see the difference between hunger or thirst and other bodily sufferings. If one can get over the smallpox by simply ignoring it or considering it as an illusion, why can't an empty stomach be treated in the same way? Or even an empty purse? To be really consistent, she would have said, "Even if your purse seemed to be stuffed with bills and coin, there is no real existence in matter, which they would seem to be." And even if you had just had a good dinner, and plenty of wine or beer to drink, there would be no real existence in this; it would be merely one of the many illusions or delusions of "mortal mind." You would be really just as well off without them as with them. But she quite realized that all this would be too much of a strain on the credulity of anyone. So the less said about it the better.

This one little point, if brought to the front, she reasonably feared would be enough to discredit her whole gospel. So the best way, the only way in fact, was just to keep declaiming about Mind, mortal mind, and the impossibility of being sick; and, moreover, one couldn't get any money out of the business either to build churches or to teach "science" in any way, on any such principle as this. By maintaining that there was no such thing as money, one could not get enough of it even for one's own personal needs; so that wouldn't do at all. There would be no "Science of being" (at any rate well-being) on any such principle as that.

This chapter concludes with what Mrs. Eddy very appropriately calls a "platform," in which she says, "the infallibility of divine metaphysics" (as opposed, we suppose, to the human physic of "drugs") is to

be demonstrated. That is just what it is, a "platform" on which to run her campaign for success. The various errors scattered through her book are fairly well contained in it, so that it would be waste of time to go through it in detail, as most of them have already been pretty thoroughly noticed.

In this "platform," as is often the case with political ones, the real issues are dodged, if this seems to be expedient in order to catch votes. There is little in it that she has not said before. Still we will take a look at its planks.

First Plank: It begins by denying, as she has done so often, the whole dogma of creation. Not only is it beyond the power of the Almighty to create matter, but He cannot create any intelligence, however finite. "God is the only intelligence of the universe," she says. Moreover, "the individuality of Spirit, or the infinite personality, is unknown;" absolutely unknown, even to Mrs. Eddy. But really, of course, from what has just been laid down, there is not any Mrs. Eddy, and there never was any. Or if there was, there was no intelligence in her. She says that the knowledge of Spirit "is left to human conjecture, or to the revelation of divine science." But "conjecture" certainly seems to need some sort of intelligence. If then, no intelligence exists anywhere in the universe, except in God, where does the "human conjecture" come in? And if there is no human intelligence, how can there be any human conjecture? And how can there be any "revelation of divine Science," without some intelligence to reveal it to? Spirit, Mind, of course, is thoroughly acquainted with divine Science, and needs no revelation of it.

It is really astonishing that Mrs. Eddy could have

blundered so badly as this. But it might be explained, if she really had no intelligence, as she would have us believe to be the case.

Second Plank: In this she gives us something which she tries to pass off on us for an argument; at any rate, the word "therefore" occurs in it. She reminds us of a good Episcopal negro, whom we once knew, who put a "therefore" in every response to the Psalms when he was reciting them in church. He thought it had a good sound, probably. The "argument" is so remarkable, that we must give it just as it stands.

"Mind," she tells us, "is not both good and bad, for God is Mind; *therefore* there is in reality one Mind only, because there is (only) one God."

We have put in the "only," for it seemed to be needed. In this "argument," we may leave out the "not good and bad" (for it seems to be irrelevant) and simply put it in this way:

1. "There is only one God."

2. "Mind" (with a big M) is my word for God.

3. *Therefore,* there is only one mind, with either a big M or a small one.

Third Plank: "The notion that both evil and good are real is a delusion of material sense, which Science annihilates. Evil is nothing, no thing, mind or power."

It seems natural to ask her, once more, what in the world is "mortal mind?" It must be some kind of mind, if we have due regard for grammar. But it would seem to be evil, for it has, we are told, its delusions and deceives us. How is it, then, that evil is no mind? Mrs. Eddy, perhaps, would say, "Never mind; I say so, and that settles it."

Fourth Plank: "If He dwelt within what He creates, God would not be reflected, but absorbed." The same old idea that the being of God is a matter of space, and finite space too at that. Light, in the physical sense, can't be reflected if it is all absorbed. But what does she mean by God's being reflected, anyway? It is a favorite word of hers. How can anything, on this notion of hers, be reflected, except by something outside of itself? Then after all, there must be something in some way outside of God. But she has just told us that there is no intelligence outside of God; and she often tells us that matter has no existence whatever. What is it, then, that reflects God? She also states in this plank, that "life is no more confined to the forms which reflect it than substance is to its shadow." But whom is she hitting at? Whoever said that it was?

Fifth Plank: Here again we find that "nothing possesses reality or existence except the divine Mind and His ideas;" just another denial of creation, and of herself as a part of it. Then she sagely remarks that "God is Spirit;" and that "in Spirit (meaning God) all is Life, and there is no death. Everything in God's universe expresses Him." Of course we all admit that. But the last sentence is rather vague. And it seems rather inconsistent, for according to her teaching, there isn't anything in God's universe, except Himself to express Him.

Sixth Plank: In this the same misapprehension as to the Divine infinity comes out again. God, it tells us, "fills all space, and it is impossible to conceive of such omnipresence or individuality except as infinite Spirit of Mind."

In fact, the notion of God as "filling all space,"

in the material sense in which she holds it, shuts out that of "individuality," in the proper or grammatical sense of the word. "Individuality" means, properly, indivisibility; but if God fills all space, according to her notion, part of Him would be in one part of it, another part in another. The term does apply to God, and to all spiritual beings; Mrs. Eddy is right enough about that. But the idea of "filling all space" is incompatible with it. This mistake is likely to occur with people like Mrs. Eddy, whose notions are mainly materialistic, and derived from the material senses.

Seventh Plank: This is truly a hodge-podge. "Life, Truth, and Love," we are told, constitute the triune Person called God—that is, the triply divine Principle, Love. They represent a trinity in unity, three in one—the same in essence, though multiform in office: God the Father-Mother; Christ the spiritual idea of sonship; divine Science or the Holy Comforter. These three express in divine Science the threefold essential nature of the infinite. They also indicate the divine Principle of scientific being, the intelligent relation of God to man and the universe.

It has seemed worth the space needed to quote this in full, as a choice specimen of unmeaningness. Poor Mrs. Eddy seems to have glanced at some theological works on the Holy Trinity, and thought that she would just dash at a sort of imitation of their language, in which her pet words, "principle, represent, express, indicate," etc., could be utilized.

Eighth Plank: "Father-Mother is the name for Deity, which indicates His (why not His-Her?) tender relationship to His (or His-Her) spiritual creation." The chief difficulty in this is that there isn't,

according to Mrs. Eddy, any creation, material or even spiritual, towards which to have a tender relation, as she already has sufficiently shown. As to "Father-Mother," we fail to see any need of bringing in the idea of sex in Deity at all. When we are told that Father-Mother is the name for Deity, it merely means that this name is a fad of Mrs. Eddy's, for which she does not scruple to pervert the words of Scripture.

Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Planks: The main object of these planks is to assert that Christ never actually existed. He was only an idea, "voicing" good. And the same must be held even if you call Him by the name of Jesus. The "corporeal" man Jesus, we learn, "was human." But of course, there really never was any human being; we have learned that, at any rate. Nothing really exists except the Divine. These seeming existences were only "expressions." Christ Jesus "expressed" the highest type of divinity which a fleshly form could express in that age, when Mrs. Eddy, the highest possible type, had not yet been revealed.

Twelfth Plank: In this plank, the poor woman goes out of her way to show her ignorance. As to our Saviour's name, Jesus, she would have it that this was just a name that happened to be given to Him, as it was to Joshua, who brought the Israelites into the Promised Land. But she omits to say, and seems not to know, that it *means* Saviour, and had that meaning in Joshua's case also. As to that of Our Lord Himself, its meaning ought to have been still more evident. "Thou shalt call His name Jesus," said the angel to St. Joseph, "for He shall save His people from their sins." But she really was not very well up on Scripture.

As to His name Christ, she hazards a guess that "it expresses God's spiritual, external nature." Any ordinary student of Greek knows that it simply means "anointed." Christ Jesus is literally translated "Anointed Saviour;" Mrs. Eddy, however, tells us that it "signifies the Godlike" better than Jesus the Christ; which she says was "the proper name of our Master in the Greek." (Just why it should have any different or "better" signification in one order of the words rather than in the reverse, is, of course, not apparent.)

The whole business is a curious example of a sort of brazen stupidity. Somebody, it seems, must have told the poor creature that the Greek word "Christ" and Hebrew word "Messiah" were, as she correctly states, synonymous; but she seems to have forgotten to ask what either of them meant. So she just guessed that they must mean "spirituality" in some way, for she had that word as one of her fads; though her notions of spirituality were, as we have seen, quite materialistic. As to the Greek word "Jesus," or the Hebrew "Joshua," she seems to have thought that they couldn't mean much of anything. They were just names, that was all.

Thirteenth Plank: In this she seems to have felt the difficulty caused by Our Lord's assertions of His Divinity, which we have already mentioned, and tried to get out of it as follows: "The divine image, idea, or Christ was, is, and ever will be, inseparable from the divine Principle, God." So, she tells us, that when Jesus said, "Before Abraham was, I Am," all that He meant was that this "Christ," as the "spiritual idea—the reflection of God"—was lying around, as it were, loose in the world, even before Abraham's

time; and that Abraham, Jacob, Moses and the prophets "caught glorious glimpses" of it; and indeed it would appear that, according to her, this was all that Jesus Himself claimed to have. A steady view of it, of course, was reserved for Mrs. Eddy, who in the fullness of time was to be revealed.

How much better it would have been for Mrs. Eddy if Our Lord, when He saw that the Jews did not understand what He said about Abraham, had simply explained that His meaning was that "the one Spirit includes all identities," as He might have done if Mrs. Eddy had been there to prompt Him with these words of her plank. That would have stopped at once their taking up stones to cast at Him, and set them merely to puzzling as to what He was talking about now. When they gave it up, they might have sent someone to inquire, and have got the whole "platform," or as much of it as He had yet learned.

Fourteenth Plank: In this we have simply a repetition of the preceding one to show that she really meant it.

Fifteenth Plank: In this we have it in a slightly different shape, combined with her ignorance as to what the word "Christ" means. Another notion now comes in, that the name "Jesus" was somehow connected with His bodily appearance (which of course was a delusion of mortal mind) and of course only lasted till the cloud (of course another delusion) took its place. Poor woman! She has, it may be, got over her delusions now. One day she will do so, even more completely; the day of which St. John tells us, when He will come with the clouds again. "Behold, He cometh with the clouds, and every eye

shall see Him, and they also that pierced Him" (Apoc. i. 7).

She leaves out all this first part of the Apocalypse from her absurd "key of the Scriptures." It is a wonder that she was not warned by its concluding words (though she also leaves them out):

"If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from these things that are written in this book."

But she doesn't care an atom, nor, as it would appear, do her deluded "students," for St. John or anybody else. *Science and Health* is the only book that she gives to them as inspired. What was Christ Himself but a very imperfect "student" of her revelation which was to come? And what could His Apostles be, but second-hand students, knowing even less than He?

Sixteenth Plank: In this, she ventures even further in her audacious tampering with Scripture. "The Revelator" (not that she cares a snap for Him, except as a hook to hang her delusions on) she says, "represents the Son of Man as saying: 'I am the first and the last: I am He that liveth and was dead (not understood), and behold, I am alive for evermore (Science has explained me).' This is a mystical statement of the eternity of the Christ, and is also a reference to the human sense of Jesus crucified." The only thing needed to complete the enormity of this would be to say something about the "eternity of the Eddy."

Seventeenth Plank: In this we find a "theory" mentioned, that spirit is distinct from matter, but must

pass through it, or into it, to be individualized." Wonder who holds or ever held this crazy notion! No Christian of any kind, so far as heard from. Perhaps it was Eddy herself.

Eighteenth Plank: Here we find creation denied again; she does not really seem to have any idea what the word means. The following passage is particularly rich: "There is nothing in Spirit out of which matter could be made;" as if it were necessary to have something to make it "out of." Then follows this gem: "For," as the Bible declares, she remarks with a triumphant air, "without the Logos, the Æon or Word of God, was not anything made that was made." She actually seems to imagine this to mean that whatever was made was made "out of" the Logos, as a sort of raw material; and that as the Logos is Spirit, matter could not be made "out of" it; so, whatever might have been made "out of" the Logos, it could not be "matter," at any rate. She persistently ignores the obvious meaning of the words, namely, that the Logos *created* the universe, and did not need anything to make it out of. "Without the Logos" means in the Gospel, of course, without the Logos as Creator; not as material for creation.

We are sorry to have to treat this great subject with apparent irreverence. But the Scripture tells us that we must sometimes "answer a fool according to his folly" (Prov. xxvi. 5). It is true that it also warns us that we may not altogether succeed in this or in any way; for it says that "though thou shouldest bray a fool in the mortar, his folly would not be taken from him" (Prov. xxvii. 22). Still, it may sometimes be taken from others who are being infected by it; for people sometimes do "catch" dis-

eases in spite of what our dear little Eddie may say.

Nineteenth Plank: This is meant to deny a dogma which no Christian holds, so far as we are aware, that the human soul is a material substance. But in language, it is all mixed up, as usual.

Twentieth Plank: Much of the same kind. Nothing new in it, except "Father-Mother" and the word "suppositional," which is a sort of Eddian fad. Perhaps it may be in use as a "scientific" password.

Twenty-first, Twenty-second and Twenty-third Planks: Here Mrs. Eddy's materialistic notions crop out again. "Mind never enters the finite;" it is too big, of course. The old story of the quart and the pint pot. The ideas of "reflection" and "emanation" are also materialistic in origin, though they seem to her to solve her difficulty.

Twenty-fourth Plank: Finally, in a sort of desperation, she falls back on the statement that "God and man coexist and are eternal." This, of course, means that man exists from eternity, that his existence is necessary, not contingent or dependent, and is the same as that of God. Every man rises to the level of the eternal Son, the second person of the Blessed Trinity. This comes of dabbling in mysteries which none of us can thoroughly understand, and from denying the idea of creation.

Twenty-fifth Plank: In this, the idea just mentioned, becomes still more evident. "The Son (with a capital S) must be in accord with the Father." To claim a patent, as it were, on this dogma, she has to imply, as she so often does, that the ordinary or unscientific Christian regards human personality as being simply "material sensation."

Twenty-sixth and Twenty-seventh Planks: She tries to extend the same patent to Our Lord's words that the "pure of heart can see God;" as if Christians generally believed in nothing except "sensualism."

Twenty-eighth Plank: This repeats, or implies, her old charge, that the "unscientific" believe that man originates in matter.

Twenty-ninth Plank: This begins with something intended for a pun, rendering the name "Adam" as "a dam," or obstruction; and that it (just how it does not appear) "suggests the thought of something fluid, of mortal mind in solution." She confesses, however, that "the dissection and definition of words, aside from their metaphysical (probably she means etymological) derivation is not scientific."

Next, she goes on to state that "Jehovah declared the ground was accursed; and from this ground or matter sprang Adam." She does not seem to have noticed that the words "cursed is the earth in thy work" were only uttered after the Fall; not at the time when Adam sprung from it. On the contrary, we read that at that time, "God saw all the things that He had made, and they were very good" (Gen. i. 31). And yet she actually quotes this passage in her "Key."

Thirtieth Plank: In this, we see again, the notion, which she imagines, or pretends to imagine, that we entertain, that sin is pardoned without being abandoned.

Thirty-first Plank: "Evil cannot be the product of God." We never heard of anyone that said that it was.

Thirty-second and last Plank: In this plank, after some of the usual beating about the bush, we come right down to business, in one little sentence, which

contains the whole Eddian gospel. "You conquer error by denying its verity." If this will only work, it is a most valuable and important statement. Let us see if it will.

In the present very terrible conflict in Europe, for instance, Russia holds that Germany is in error, or, as we may say, that it *is* error itself. Germany, similarly, holds that Russia is. All that Russia has to do to conquer Germany is to deny the verity of Germany, or in other words, that Germany has any real existence. And the same is all that is needed by Germany to conquer Russia. What, then, is the need of killing so many people? None at all, if both parties follow this line. But one does not quite see how either is to conquer anything at all. Everything remains *in statu quo*. But if only one follows this line ignoring the other, it is a safe bet that the other will whip.

And so, if we start "to get rid of sin by Science," by not "admitting that sin can have pain or pleasure," when in point of fact it has them, the pleasure of it will allure, while the pain being more remote, does not counterbalance the pleasure. Sin will win, with most people, all the time. No, the truth is, and always will be, that as we read in the book of Job, "the life of man upon earth is a warfare," and victory cannot be got by pretending that there is no enemy. This notion is simply "an illusion of mortal mind," far more dangerous than any of the real facts which Mrs. Eddy calls by that name.

It is refreshing to get through, at last, with this "Science of Being" chapter, which tries one's patience even more than any of the preceding ones. In the next, it would seem that we might expect not quite

so much talk about "science," and perhaps something a little more to the point; for it is called

CHAPTER XI.

Some Objections Answered.

We are, however, doomed to disappointment. "Science" sticks up its head, even more prominently than before. After a short introductory paragraph, we find the following astounding statement:

"In Christian Science, mere opinion is valueless. Proof is essential to a due estimate of this subject."

We had an idea that to prove anything one had to start with some premises admitted by the party to whom the proof was to be presented, and to proceed by logically deducing a conclusion from them. But Mrs. Eddy's idea is different. She proves her conclusions by simply stating them. This is just the reason why they are not scientific at all, as noted in our preface. The only way in which they can be made to appear so, is by taking as granted by her opponent something which he had no idea of holding, or, in other words, by setting up a "straw man" to knock him down. She begins with remarking that "sneers at the application of the word *Science* to Christianity cannot prevent that from being scientific which is based on divine principle, demonstrated according to a divine given rule, and subjected to proof."

Now, in the first place, it is possible, of course, that there may be someone who sneers in the way that she alleges. But we have never happened to meet any such. If she had spoken of "sneers" at the application of the word "Science" to her so-called "Chris-

tian Science," some such persons might be found. But she would make it appear that there are persons who "sneer" at the notion that Christianity in any form can be considered as scientific.

This "straw-man," however, is withdrawn right away, and another is substituted for him. This one asserts, or implies at any rate, that there are some people who indulge in "unqualified condemnations of scientific Mind-healing." By the big M, we judge that she means that these people condemn the idea that Mind (or according to her notation, God) can heal anyone of anything, or at any rate in any "scientific" way.

In point of fact, however, there are not, so far as we are aware, any Christians, or even any who believe in God at all, who do not believe that God can heal anyone of any disease, whether bodily or mental; and of course we all believe that He can do so, if He chooses, without the use of any "drugs," or any other "second or intermediate causes." He, of course, can also do it, if He so wills, even if those who are to be healed hold what Mrs. Eddy calls "scientific" notions. Being a living and personal God, He does not do it by holding her notion that He is only a vague and impersonal Mind, "filling all space," for He cannot hold what is not true. But He is not bound to refuse to do it because those who are to be healed have been deluded by such ideas. He knows that we are only weak and ignorant creatures, liable to even the wildest errors, but does not necessarily withhold His mercy to us on that account. "He maketh His sun to rise upon the good and bad, and raineth upon the just and the unjust." He may reward, at any rate, with temporal blessings, and dispose for eternal ones, those who be-

lieve, even in an imperfect and erroneous way, in Him, as, for instance, is recorded by St. Mark vii. 25-29. So nothing prevents Him from healing the sick or the sinner, even in what perhaps Mrs. Eddy would call a "scientific" way.

It is true that by any such display of His power or mercy He will not give any formal approval of false doctrines, as opposed to true ones; but He may reward those who seek Him ignorantly, if they are not to blame for their ignorance. Or to come down to the actual case in hand; a student of "Christian Science" may obtain a cure of some disease from Him, when a mere materialist, not believing in Him at all, but simply and solely in "drugs," would not. But that does not prove that "Christian Science" is an improvement on real Christianity.

But Mrs. Eddy falls into her usual misstatements in saying that "he that decries this Science does it presumptuously, in the face of Bible history and in defiance of the direct command of Jesus." She would make it appear that he that decries this "Science" decries any power in God to heal the sick; as if one who decries this "Science" must decry Christianity altogether.

She proceeds in the next paragraph to "let the cat out of the bag," as it were more visibly. "If Christianity is not scientific," she says, "and Science is not of God, then there is no invariable law, and truth becomes an accident."

"The cat," thus let out, is now seen quite distinctly. It simply is that "Christian Science" regards God, or Mind, as not having any will of His own, but as working in much the same way as materialists believe matter does, by an absolutely "invariable law;" and

moreover holds that the same results will always follow when the conditions are the same.

Mrs. Eddy really seems to regard "Mind" as a sort of force of which we have complete control. We have only to put ourselves in "harmony" with it, and it can be turned on to suit our needs, or even our mere wishes, just as easily as one turns on the steam in an engine. She seems to have had a suspicion, just about here, that she was making her "Christian Science" a little too "scientific," and that some dust must be raised to hide the issue. So she says:

"Christian Science awakens the sinner, reclaims the infidel, and raises from the couch of pain the helpless invalid." But the question which one naturally asks is, "does it do these things all the time? Does not truth, on its principles, become an "accident," as she says it will, if not scientific? "Sometimes it works, and sometimes it doesn't."

The facts which she alleges, can be accounted for just as well, and indeed much better, by the usual Christian teaching on this subject. The ordinary, or normal, Christian believes in "Mind," that is to say, in God, just as firmly as she or any of her "students," and much more so. We believe "our Master's" words, when it is a question about "healing the sick" (which she takes as the whole Gospel) just as thoroughly as she does or can. If we did not, why should we pray, as we constantly do, for the sick? And many of us take the words of the Apostle St. James very seriously and practically, when he says:

"Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and

the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."

We think that this, which the Apostle recommends, is better than to sit by the sick man and put ourselves and him, as far as possible, in harmony with "Mind." And that it is still more of an improvement on any sort of "absent treatment." But we do not believe that it is going to work every time. We do not believe that even in the matter of sin (a far more important one than that of bodily illness) it is going to work automatically, or according to any "invariable law." We do not pretend that it is that sort of "Christian Science." But we know, as a matter of constant (and indeed daily) experience, that it does work, when God so wills; and we are sure that God has willed that we should use this means which He Himself has appointed.

If it were to work every time, no Christian would ever die. That it does not, is no fatal objection to our belief; all we are looking for is a prolongation of life, and (what is more important) the forgiveness of sin. But the invariable "Science" of Mrs. Eddy fails and disproves itself when it doesn't work. So it seems to us "unscientific" people, that our method is more of a success than hers.

We may notice, just by the way, a statement by Mrs. Eddy (though not immediately touching our present subject) that "Paul was not one of Jesus' students." Strangely, however, we find that "Paul" thought that he was such. He says (Gal. i. 11-12): "I give you to understand, brethren, that the Gospel that was preached by me was not according to man. For neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." And this

passage is, of course, substantially the same in Mrs. Eddy's own Bible. But, as we remarked a little while ago, Mrs. Eddy was not very familiar with the Bible. *Science and Health* was the book for her. Even in that, she does not seem to know, in some places, what she wrote in others.

Right after this she says that "whoever is the first meekly and conscientiously to press along the line of gospel-healing is often accounted a heretic." Not, so far as we know, if he presses along the line of gospel-healing as laid down in the Scriptures. If he presses too far along the line of "Mind-healing" (a term not found in the Scriptures), perhaps he might be.

Another curious statement is made by her on the next page; she alleges that it is objected to Christian Science that "it claims God as the only absolute Life and Soul, and man is His idea—that is, His image."

We do not know who makes this objection. But certainly it cannot be a Christian of any kind. For all Christians undoubtedly recognize God as the only absolute (we suppose that she means the only self-existent and independent) Life and Soul, and that man was as the Bible tells us, "made to His image and likeness." They do not say, however, that man is simply "His idea," if she means "His only idea." And the great majority of Christians hold that the likeness of man to God was very much injured by the Fall of Adam; which, of course, Mrs. Eddy always ignores.

In ending this paragraph, she asks (apparently as a sort of clincher) "is it sacrilegious to assume that God's likeness is not found in matter, sin, sickness, or death?" She lumps all these four together, of

course. As to "matter, of course, she seems to forget that after saying, "let us make man to our image and likeness." God, as the sacred writer tells us, "formed man of the dust of the ground" (as her version has it). Mrs. Eddy, however, as we see in her *Key to the Scriptures*, does not stick at a little thing like that. In that "Key," she asks, "is this addition to His creation real or unreal?" (We hardly see how it could be an "addition," being made before man was.)

Then she goes on, "is it the truth, or a lie concerning man and God? *It must be a lie*, for God presently curses the ground." Again she forgets that this was not until after the Fall, and that then it was on Adam's disobedience. "Cursed is the ground *for thy sake*" are the words in her own version.

To speak plainly, the real reason why she has to make it a lie, is because it does not fit in with her own wild theories. These words, and indeed anything in Scripture or anywhere, must be a lie, if not in "harmony with *Science and Health*." She shows this plainly in her introduction to her "Key." It is not a key to a better understanding of an inspired book, the Word of God, but just a key to unlock, and get rid of, the absurd idea that it is God's Word. No book is inspired, except *Science and Health*. Even on that, no human commentaries are allowed. You have just got to read it, and swallow it right down. She actually quotes words from the Apocalypse in the outset of her "Key." "The angel," we there read, said to St. John, "take the book and eat it up." Mrs. Eddy actually has the audacity to apply these words to her own absurd book. She paraphrases them as follows:

"Then will a voice from harmony cry: Go and take the little book.....Take it and eat it up; and it shall make thy belly bitter, but it shall be in thy mouth sweet as honey. Mortals obey the heavenly evangel. Take divine Science. Read this book from beginning to end. Study it, ponder it." But before reading it, pay five dollars for it. That is more important than even to read it.

She does not begin to apply any "key" to the Apocalypse, till she can get it to say something which she can interpret as a favorable notice of her book. That is all that is good for anything in what St. John, or anyone else, can say.

It is hard to imagine how pride and impiety can go much farther than this. It will not, perhaps, open the eyes of those who have fully surrendered to her really devilish delusions. But it may be the means of saving others from them who have not yet completely become their victims. We hope that such will be warned while there is yet time. One would think that its silliness and ignorance would be enough to scare readers away; but evidently they have not been so.

To resume where we left off, however, we cheerfully concede that God's likeness is not found in "sin, sickness and death." But it does not follow from this that man in his fallen state, is not subject to these.

In spite of the spiritual danger of the Eddian doctrine, and its impiety, which we have to show up, sometimes, as just now, we have to be amused now and then, by its comicality, as we go along. As, for instance, when she says, that "when the omnipotence of God is preached and His absoluteness is set forth,

Christian sermons will heal the sick." We had an impression that sermons were not allowed by Mrs. Eddy, as they might introduce a human element into her ineffable revelations. But here she seems to throw out a hint, as it were, of suitable subjects for sermons, and says, as it would seem, that if these subjects were strictly adhered to, sick people might be cured by them, even right in church. That would surely be a great improvement over the soporific effect with which we are more familiar. But the subjects she wants to have "set forth" are in fact often treated of.

Another funny little sentence: "The thought," she says, "of human, material nothingness, which Science inculcates, enrages the carnal mind." We should think that the "carnal mind" would be more likely to laugh at such an absurd thought than to get "enraged" at it.

Would anyone believe that even Mrs. Eddy could write such a sentence at this? "Do you feel the pain of tooth-pulling," she asks, "when you believe that nitrous-oxide gas has made you unconscious?" Try some other kind of gas (Mrs. Eddy's, for instance), and no matter how much you believe that it has this property, you will feel the pain as much as ever, and also the pain of listening to her nonsense.

One absolute false statement of fact, which she makes in this chapter, cannot be passed by in silence. It is that "the Christian opponents of Christian Science neither give nor offer any proofs that their Master's religion can heal the sick." She may, perhaps, refuse to listen to any proofs which we give and offer; but to say that they are not given and offered, and in immense numbers, is simply a lie, only

excusable, if at all, by the unfathomable ignorance which she shows so frequently.

She repeats it on the very next page. "Popular religion," she says, "declines to admit that Christ's religion has exercised any systematic healing power since the first century." It seems to us that the religion of the great majority of Christians may have some slight claim to be considered "popular." But she seems (or pretends) never to have heard of any Christian religion except that of the "orthodox Congregational Church," of which, she tells us, that she "became a member in early years." The point, it should be observed, is not whether Christ's religion has actually exercised any such "healing power," but whether such a claim is popularly made for it.

This chapter is entitled "Some Objections Answered." But we practically do not find that Mrs. Eddy even states any objections which she is supposed to be answering. Just a little snip here and there, that is all, answered by a wilderness of the same old stuff that she is constantly repeating.

Once more, before concluding this chapter, she takes occasion again to explicitly deny the dogma of the Incarnation and of the Holy Trinity, and reduces them both down to the idea that our Divine Lord was in no way different from the rest of us; that when He said, "I and My Father are one." He simply meant that, as with all of us, "in Him we live, and move, and have our being." And she again lets out her quantitative, or materialist, notion of infinity. She says that He meant by what He said, "one in quality, not in quantity. The Christian," she says, "recognizes that Jesus Christ is not God, as Jesus Himself declared, but is the Son of God. God and man, Father and son"

(now with a small "s") "are in one being." Thus flippantly she disposes of the practically universal belief of Christianity; as if no one could possibly believe anything like that.

We are not quite sure, however, whether Mrs. Eddy meant that "Jesus Himself declared" that He was God, or that He was not. Probably, however, it was the latter, as she says that the "Christian" recognizes that opinion. It is, at any rate, well to notice this "Christian" opinion of hers once again, that Christians in general may be more thoroughly warned by it against her other errors.

With this, it is perhaps allowable to conclude this chapter, in which the theoretical part of this alleged "science" should logically have been completed, and all the objections to it refuted. Of course next to nothing has been attempted by the author in either of these lines; no clear and consistent scheme of doctrine has been developed, nor have the "objections," even such as may emerge in this chapter or others from the mass of verbiage which makes up the whole thing, been made in any formal way. And it is not binding on us to formulate a set of definite objections to a set of vague assertions, a great many of which are simply statements that the opponents of her "science" hold views which they are really never dreamt of; they are attacks on what does not exist, or in other words, on a "straw man." We hope, however, before finally concluding our examination of this mass of stuff, to give some statements of the true Christian and common sense doctrine which she endeavors to combat in it, and contrast them with her wild errors.

But as she really has not yet got through with her

exposition of this false "science" (in spite of what might appear from the titles of her chapters), we shall have to proceed with these chapters in the order in which they are given. Even in the next one, they will be repeated. It is called

CHAPTER XII.

Christian Science Practice.

This chapter certainly begins in rather a surprising way. One would have expected to find, at the outset, and indeed all through, directions as to the proper rules to be observed in working up people who imagined themselves to be sick into a firm conviction that there was really nothing the matter with them. That is all that there is in the whole system; so why not get right to work on it at once? But no, instead of this, we find the Gospel account of St. Mary Magdalen coming into the house of the Pharisee where Jesus was sitting at meat. We all know this beautiful and true story so well that there is no need to give it in full. But what has it to do with Christian Science, or with its practice?

The instruction which Mrs. Eddy apparently wishes to give by it to "practitioners" (as we believe they are called), is that they must cultivate a spirit of sympathy, like that of Jesus for the sinner; sympathy, we suppose, for their errors in supposing that there is and reality in matter, or anything except "Mind" in the world.

It seems to be her idea that the ordinary medical "practitioner" (if we may be allowed to use this sacred word) is brutal and scornful, like the Pharisee, in his treatment of the sick that he regards it as

being their own fault that they are sick. And that so he thinks the proper way to proceed is to punish them for this fault by stuffing some horrid and nauseous "drugs" down their throats, or perhaps by cutting them up with his instruments of torture; if the case seems grave enough to call for it; or, at any rate, that doctors, and even nurses, in their ordinary work, have no sympathy for the sick, and that "Scientists" must show that they have it.

We must allow that doctors, and nurses also, are in fact, and in a way, hardened to the sufferings of their patients by seeing so much of them, and, moreover, that they do not think it their proper place to offer spiritual consolation, but are inclined to think that the clergyman can do that work better, and that they can do their own work more effectually by confining their attention to it. In spite of this drawback, however, we think that general experience shows that doctors and professional nurses, are as a rule quite nice people, and that their visits, as far as their personal behavior is concerned, are enjoyed and looked forward to by the patients whom they may have in charge; furthermore, that they are not at all likely to indulge in "quoting theories, stereotyped, borrowed speeches, and the doling of arguments." Mrs. Eddy seems to complain that some "science" practitioners are apt to err in this way, and that they need to be warned against it. And though having no personal experience in the matter, we should not be surprised if this were the case.

We have found that, as a fact, "Scientists" are somewhat in the habit of "gushing" about their theories, which may be explained by there being so little except "gush" in them. But the difficulty about

the regular "unscientific" physician seems to be that he says so little about his theories to his patient. He seems to think that he must only talk to other doctors about them.

For the "metaphysician," however, Mrs. Eddy gives the following warning. (It is really funny, by the way, that she really seems to have no idea at all what the word actually means.) "In order to cure his patient," she says, "the metaphysician must first cast moral evils out of himself, and thus obtain the spiritual fredom which will enable him to cast physical evils out of his patient." (We had an idea, by the way, that there really were no "physical evils" in his patient to cast out. But we may let that pass. This sort of thing occurs so often.) But we don't quite understand what she means by "moral evils." If she means sinful habits and desires, we all acknowledge, of course, that this is very good advice for "the metaphysician," as it is for everyone else. It is not, however, at all new. But in "scientific" language, we thought that all moral evils were just "errors of mortal mind." And anyone enough advanced to be a "practitioner," ought to have got rid of these, one would think, long ago.

She goes on, however, to explain. "The physician," she says (of course, if he is a "scientist" he is a metaphysician, so it is all the same), "must also watch, lest he be overcome by a sense of the odiousness of sin and by the unveiling of sin in his own thoughts."

This seems rather strange, with good respectable patients. But what Mrs. Eddy means by "sin" is immediately made plain. It is not anything in will or act, but only in belief. "The sick," she tells us, "are terrified by their sick beliefs," that is to say

the beliefs that they are really sick. So she says, "sinners should be affrighted by their sinful beliefs," these are, probably, that there is any difference between them and "Mind." But "the Christian Scientist," she assures us, "will be calm in the presence of both sin and disease, knowing, as he does, that Life is God, and God is All." As he knows this, he has no beliefs which are sick or sinful; and can get such belief's right out of his patient, even if he says nothing about them. They will just "catch" them from him. His presence, or even his absence, if it is a case of "absent treatment," will be quite enough.

We have always rather wondered how this works in the case of "Christian Science" dentists. But perhaps there are not many. Or rather, we understand that there are some, but they do not use it in their practice; or, in other words, that they are not "practitioners," and evidently could not be advanced to that grade. Of course, if they were they would only have to sit by the side of the patient's chair and triumphantly see the illusion of there being any aching tooth disappear; perhaps, a little cocaine might be given, just to help the good work along. Of course it would be absurd to try to pull out a thing which does not exist. As to there really being any tooth, aching or otherwise, both dentist and patient would of course "turn from the lie of false belief and gather the facts of being from the divine Mind."

Christians also prefer to get the facts of being from the divine Mind, but not by throwing away the means which He has provided for us to enable us to do so.

But we must proceed with this foolish book. A little farther on, our attention is arrested by this remarkable statement: "that Life is not contingent on

bodily conditions is proved, when we learn that life and man survive the body." Christians learn this in childhood, as soon as they are able to learn or understand anything, but Mrs. Eddy seems not to have been rightly instructed in her early years. Yet we thought that the "orthodox Congregational Church" believed in a life after death. But they, and other reasonable people, do not prove from it that life is not contingent on bodily conditions; for they know that in the ordinary sense of the word life, it means the union of soul and body, and that the latter will wear out, and become unfit for this union, whereas the former will not; and that therefore life, in this normal sense of the word, *is* contingent on bodily conditions, as experience constantly proves; and Mrs. Eddy "proved" that she was no exception to the rule. But she tried in this sentence to make a sort of haze or confusion by spelling "life" in the first part of it with a big L. If asked about this, she could say that that Life (with a big L) means the Divine Life. Of course we all admit that this is not contingent; but we do not admit that human life and Divine Life are identical. The latter is necessary; the former is created by it, and is contingent.

Of course it is understood that in this chapter she is supposed to be talking to people who have, partially at any rate, swallowed her nonsense; but to repeat it in this chapter, which is supposed to be concerned with practice, rather than theory, is hardly keeping to the point. It looks as if she were afraid that when going into practice, the theory might slip away from them.

A little later, she gives an example, as she does so often, of her unfamiliarity with Scripture. Really, of

course, she has no need of it, *Science and Health* being the only thoroughly inspired book. But she ventures to make a guess that "Jesus never asked if disease were acute or chronic." She does not seem to have read the ninth chapter of St. Mark's Gospel. In verse twenty, we find these words, "How long time is it since this has happened to him? But he (the father) said: From his infancy." Not that it made any real difference to Our Lord how long a disease had lasted. But poor Mrs. Eddy thought that she might score a point somehow, and so forgot to "look before she leaped."

She continues immediately, that "He" (Jesus) "never recommended attention to laws of health, never gave drugs, never prayed to know if God were willing that a man should live." This certainly sounds strange to Christians, who know that Our Lord really was God, and that if He chose to exercise His Divine Power, needed no "laws of health" or "drugs." To "Scientists," however, it is simply an exhortation to remember that they really are God, just as well as Jesus was, and have the stream of Divine power to turn on whenever they may wish to do so. It would be quite absurd for a "Scientist" to pray; they don't need to pray, even to Mrs. Eddy.

But we find in this very chapter of St. Mark which has just been quoted, that in the case there narrated, which the "students" of the "Christian Science" of Jesus had failed to cure, and asked Him the reason for their failure, that He told them for their instruction, that "this kind can go out by nothing, but by prayer and fasting." It did not follow because He did not need these, that the "students" did not. And He Himself, as the Gospels tell us, gave them His ex-

ample as well as His precept. Moreover, since according to "Science," His chief work on earth was to "heal the sick" (though real Christians do not think so), His prayer, even when He was praying for the whole night (Luke vi. 12), must have been made mainly for that purpose.

Shortly after this we are astounded by a statement that homœopathy, according to Mrs. Eddy, does sometimes cure disease. She accounts for this by its requiring more faith than the regular or "allopathic" system; but she says "this confirms my theory that the faith in the drug is the sole factor in the cure." The really astounding part is that she should talk about "my theory." We have understood, all along, that she did not have any "theories," that with her, all her "science" had come by revelation.

But another "theory" soon appears. "What you call matter was originally error in solution," she informs us; it became matter, then, we suppose, by the solution being boiled down or evaporated, with a precipitation of the error in the form of matter. One "theory" about this "error" or "elementary mortal mind," as she tells us that "error is called when in solution," is, that "its sensations can reproduce man, can form blood, flesh, and bones." We don't know whether she approves of this theory or not; but it seems as if her "science" was getting a little shaky when she begins to talk about "theories." This one seems to be rather in the domain of chemistry.

A little farther on she begins to make some rules, as it would seem, which really may be intended for what the chapter is supposed to treat on, that is to say, "Christian Science Practice." The first particular ailment she applies them to is intermittent

fever, or what she calls "chills and heat, or chills and fever." "Change the mental state," she says, "and the chills and fever disappear." But with sensible people, who look at facts, and are not imaginative, it is not so easy to change the mental state. Our family doctor once tried that on the present writer, when the latter was suffering in childhood, with a rather bad case of this complaint, by telling him that in really severe ones the house could be seen to shake by people outside. That was a little in the "scientific" line, but of course it was fatal to any thorough science to admit that there were or could be any really severe cases. It was rather amusing, and in a way encouraging, to have him say that; but it did not produce any effect on what shaking there was; so he concluded, later on, to give a good strong dose of ordinary quinine, and keep on with it till the trouble was actually cured.

Mrs. Eddy, however, goes further than most practitioners would, probably, venture on doing with a fairly intelligent child. "If the body is material, it cannot," she asserts with apparent seriousness, "suffer with a fever." Well, of course, it doesn't suffer in the strict sense of the word, without a mind to receive the sensations which can be got from it. But just put in a thermometer under the tongue, and if you find it reading one hundred and four degrees or so, you may very safely bet that it has got a fever, and a pretty bad one. Well, she has the same rigmarole in all other cases of which she mentions. Palsy, consumption, and all other diseases disappear when you believe that you have not got them. But the difficulty is to believe that you have not got them, when you know that you have.

It all sounds very easy. "The efficient remedy," we are told, "is to destroy the patient's false belief by both silently and audibly arguing the true facts with regard to harmonious being." But the ordinary common sense patient would say, "I don't care a rap about 'harmonious being' just now. When I get well it might amuse me, but now I am too sick."

What she says on the next page is really funnier than usual, and quite worth quoting. It is, that "the author never knew a patient who did not recover when the belief of the disease had gone." Recover from what? Why, of course, from the false belief of disease. There being no real disease, there was nothing else to recover from. But at the time of recovery from this false belief, the false belief had already gone, and there was nothing at all left from which to recover. The author, then, "never knew a patient who did not get rid of the false belief of disease when this false belief had been got rid of." This was truly remarkable; and yet she had never known even one case to the contrary. If she had said, that she never knew a patient who did not recover from a real disease when the belief that it was real had gone, that would have made sense at any rate. But she couldn't say that; it would be against her absurd principles, and "science of being." It is such a pity that she did not know a little bit more about real science before starting to talk about it.

On the same page, she gives the following title direction to "practitioners:" "If your patient believes in taking cold, mentally convince him that matter cannot take cold." She might as well say, "If your patient believes that the water in his pitcher is frozen, mentally convince him that matter cannot

freeze." Or, "If your patient thinks that his watch has stopped, mentally convince him that matter cannot stop, or start, or do anything else." But be sure that he is really patient, or he might get impatient at such nonsense.

To this stuff she adds one little grain of really good advice, such as a common-sense or real Christian might give, and often does give. "If grief causes suffering, convince the sufferer that affliction is often the source of joy." She is willing to concede that grief may cause suffering, at any rate in what she calls "mortal mind." But in fact (and she really knows it) she might as well substitute "a toothache" for "grief." She continues: "Convince the sufferer.....that he should rejoice always in ever-present Love." That is what St. Paul says: "Rejoice in the Lord always." Or again, the "Master" says: "A woman, when she is in labor, hath sorrow, because her hour is come; but when she hath brought forth the child, she remembers no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world."

It is refreshing to find her giving this little bit of real Christianity, in the midst of a wilderness of antichristian delusion. But it would not do to keep it up for too long; for the bait which she wants to hang out, to get people to take her "Science," is that if they do, they will have no anguish of any kind to feel or to remember. To get rid of all suffering in this world is the whole gospel of her antichristian science.

One other little absurdity in it may be noticed, on this same page. "The cause of all disease" (*all* disease, mind you) "is mental, even a mortal fear, a helpless, mistaken belief or fixed conviction of the

necessity and power of ill health." Imagine, if you please, a baby with a stomachache, laboring under a "helpless, mistaken belief or fixed conviction of the necessity and power of ill health!" But, of course, this exalted science is not intended for babies. Still, it is strange that they should have to suffer for the want of it. Probably the "practitioner" just lets them suffer.

Another thing that we find a little farther on, is that "if disease can attack and control the body without the consent of mortals, sin can do the same." In fact, sin is not a matter of the body, but of the soul. It does not and cannot control anything without the consent of the soul. Mrs. Eddy, like all of us, knows very well that it does *not* follow that because disease can control the body without the consent of mortals, sin can do the same.

But this chapter, though supposed to be practical, is so full of theoretical absurdities that it would be "practically" impossible to notice them all. She says: "The quickened pulse, coated tongue, febrile heat, dry skin, pain in the head and limbs, are pictures drawn on the body by a mortal mind." That must hold good for babies as well as for grown people. Again: "We cannot in reality suffer from breaking anything except a moral or spiritual law." How if one should throw a match into a barrel of gunpowder, supposing it to be charcoal for the teeth? Well, of course, according to Eddian law, one ought not to use anything for the teeth. But one might have intended to burn it up, just to prevent anyone else from using it.

One other little thing may be quoted, because it is so funny: "If half the attention given to hygiene," she says, "were given to the study of Christian

Science, and to the spiritualization of thought, this alone would usher in the millennium. But why restrict this to "half" the attention? Why give any attention to hygiene at all? She tells us that constant "bathing and rubbing to alter the secretions or to remove unhealthy exhalations from the cuticle receive a useful rebuke from Jesus' precept: "Take no thought for the body." A real Christian Scientist, it would seem, ought never to bathe, and under no circumstances to use a towel. But the whole business is so reeking with absurdities that it seems incredible that any person with even a grain of sense ould take any stock in it.

Here, however, is an interesting passage: "Because mortal mind is kept active, must it pay the penalty of a softened brain? Who dares to say that actual mind can be overworked? When we reach our limits of mental endurance, we conclude that intellectual labor has been carried sufficiently far; but when we realize that immortal Mind is ever active, and that spiritual energies can neither wear out nor can so-called material law trespass on God-given powers and resources, we are able to rest in Truth, refreshed by the assurances of immortality, opposed to mortality." This is encouraging, though we can't as yet quite accept it. For when we reach our limits of mental endurance in reading Mrs. Eddy's nonsense, we do conclude that for that day it has been carried sufficiently far, and that if we were to go on without a rest on something else, we might have to "pay the penalty of a softened brain."

One more little "gem:" "If mortals think that food disturbs the harmonious functions of mind and body, either the food or this thought must be dispensed

with, for the penalty is coupled with this belief." We can't help wondering if Mrs. Eddy would have thought it all right to eat a nice big Welsh rarebit just at bedtime. We are inclined to think that even if she did so think, she might still have had "mortal mind" enough to "report the food as undigested," which, as she confesses, sometimes does happen. But she assures us that the belief that there would in any case be any trouble is one that "totters to its falling before the battle-axe of Science." So as she, if anyone, was an expert with this battle-axe, she would have taken a "dare" to eat the rarebit, undoubtedly. Perhaps she might even have been a rival of the man who drank sulphuric acid as a good strong tonic, and when asked how he liked it, reported that it was pretty good, but that he was afraid there was something the matter with the stuff, for "when he blew his nose it burned holes in his handkerchief."

She gives a case of a woman who thought that she had chronic liver complaint, but whom she cured in a few minutes. This was evidently just a case of hypochondria. The woman, probably, didn't believe the doctors, but was persuaded to believe Mrs. Eddy. When a disease is imaginary, that is, of course, a good way to proceed against it, if the one who imagines it is willing to listen to your words. But one can hardly expect to succeed in this way, if it is a case of a tumor or cancer, which is visible to everyone. Even in such a case, however, Mrs. Eddy says that the practitioner must really refuse to believe in the existence of such things, when he "argues against their reality." Of course, if he can actually do this, it might give the force of sincerity to his arguments. But it is a pretty hard thing to do: to believe Mrs.

Eddy rather than one's own eyes. And yet she says it is "mental quackery" to balk even at this; and she has already told her practitioners that "quackery fails at length to inspire the credulity of the sick" (which is all that they have to depend on), "and then they cease to improve." So it has got to be done, however hard it may seem; or you must stop your "practice."

Well, it is about time to drop this absolutely incredible nonsense, which keeps on for quite a number of pages. And then we find some more under the title of "Mental Treatment Illustrated." Like a drowning man catching at a straw, we may have a faint hope that some facts may appear in this. But we find nothing but the same stuff which she has been giving us all along; like the man of whom Hood writes, "groping in the dark for combustibles in the coal-cellar, and finding nothing but the torturous cat and her kittens."

On the first page of this, we find something which, though not an "illustration" of anything whatever, is too bad to be let go without comment.

"It is recorded," she says, "that once Jesus asked the name of a disease—a disease which moderns call 'dementia.' The demon, or devil, replied that his name was Legion." If we look at the place where this is recorded, we find that Our Lord did not ask the name of any disease at all. Everyone, as well as He, knew that it was no disease that the man had, but that he was simply possessed by devils. What Jesus asked, of the possessing devil was what his name was; and that the answer was: "Legion; because many devils were entered into him" (Luke viii. 30).

Mrs. Eddy seems, in what she says, to try to make

out that the word "dementia" has some connection with the word "demon." But that is just an example either of her ignorance or her attempts to impose on the ignorant. She goes on to say that "thereupon Jesus cast out the evil, and the insane man was changed and straightway became whole. The Scripture seems to import that Jesus caused the evil to be self-seen and so destroyed." In fact "the Scripture seems to import" nothing of the kind. It does not "import" anything. It simply tells us, as a fact, that the "many devils" which had possessed the poor man went out of him at the Divine command; and entered into "a herd of many swine, feeding on the mountain;" and that this was in answer to a request which these devils had made.

This whole thing Mrs. Eddy deliberately omits, because it is against her theory that there can't be any real devils. It is of no importance to her that "the Master" had a different opinion, or that His opinion was confirmed by the actual facts. He was only an imperfect "student" of Christian Science, anyway; what could His opinion amount to, and why mention it when not in accord with hers?

Indeed, the same thing recorded in the Gospel occurs only too often, even now. Diabolic possession is an actual fact, and we do not have to go back to the Bible to find cases of it, though they ought to be enough for a Christian. The exorcisms of the Church are used against it, and frequently prove effectual. But it is a dangerous thing to meddle with. We read in the Acts of the Apostles that some Jewish exorcists tried to drive out devils by the formula, "I conjure you by Jesus, whom Paul preacheth." But the reply that they got was, "Jesus I know, and Paul

I know, but who are you? And the man in whom the wicked spirit was, leaping upon them, and mastering them both, prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded." We sometimes find at the present time that even when the exorcism is successful, the spirits expelled may take vengeance on the exorcist, as it is quite natural that they should.

We have dwelt upon this matter at some length, because of the unbelief which has crept in lately, even among many Bible Christians, about this plain teaching of the Bible. And even were it not taught in Scripture there are enough plain proofs of it in modern spiritism to convince those who examine the facts, and do not shut their ears to evidence, to be convinced of its reality. There is, of course, nothing new in the "illustrations," here supposed to be made. But there are some funny remarks which may enliven the reader a little.

She says, for instance, that "etherization will apparently cause the body to disappear." Wonder if it disapppears from sight of the bystanders, as well as of the person etherized. If it doesn't, nothing seems to be proved. In this little paragraph she seems to be fighting the old "straw man," as if there were somebody who held that pain is in matter independent of mind, and ought to go on when the mysterious connection of the two is temporarily broken.

Another strange phenomenon, she says, sometimes occurs: "If the reader of this book observes a great stir throughout his whole system, and certain moral and physical symptoms seem aggravated," she tells us that "these indications are favorable." One doesn't quite understand how any "great stir" can be pro-

duced by reading the book, except in the way either of amusement, or of indignation, that anyone can venture to palm off such absurdity on an unsuspecting public. We have noticed in ourselves some moral and physical symptoms of both these kinds, and are glad to know that they are favorable. She advises us to "continue to read," and the advice is probably good. Even a little stir in either of these ways is not a bad thing; it keeps life off the dead level of monotony which might be caused by more serious reading. Only one shouldn't read too much at a time, or one's mind might get unhinged, as the author's seems to have become.

She has a new word on the next page, which evidently tickled her fancy. It is the "matter-physician," whom she contrasts with the "metaphysician" of course to the advantage of the latter. She uses this last word so often that she really seems to have guessed that it must mean "mind-physician."

There are, of course, funny things on every page, but even these may become monotonous, so we refrain.

This chapter concludes with "a mental case, supposed to be on trial, as cases are tried in court." This is too long to be waded through, so we may be excused, as it is really the same old story over again. So we will go on to

CHAPTER XIII.

Teaching Christian Science.

We are glad to see, in the beginning of this, that Mrs. Eddy, even if she had had the power to require us to employ "metaphysicians" instead of the regular faculty, when attacked by some ailment, would not

have compelled us to do so. The Mind-physician, she tells us, "should give up cases of persistent failure to experience the healing power of Christian Science," and leave "invalids free to resort to whatever other systems they fancy will afford relief." And probably the same favor might be extended even to those who are so sure that there is nothing in it that they never have cared about trying it at all.

But she feels quite sure that they will come to it in the end. She does not admit the possibility, it would seem, that a regular doctor's treatment ever succeeded, or ever can succeed. "Sooner or later," she says, "all must rise superior to materiality." "If the sick find these material expedients unsatisfactory, and they receive no help from them, these very failures may open their blind eyes." But she does not tell her students what to do, if they find them satisfactory, as they do in the great majority of cases, when there is anything really the matter. If one finds that a blue pill or a dose of salts works all right, why then reserve your Christian Science for some occasion when the trouble is not so "material" would seem to be the correct procedure. "The teacher," she says, "must make clear to her students the Science of healing, especially its ethics—that all is Mind;" that is, that pantheism is the correct doctrine.

"The author trembles," we are told, "when she sees a man, for the petty consideration of money, teaching his slight knowledge of Mind-power." As, for example, selling a little book on the subject for many times the money required to produce it. The price of *Science and Health* is, we are credibly informed, "three dollars in cloth, six when it is finely bound, and shaped to imitate the Testament, and is broken into

verses." That is the way it is with the copy which we have used in this review, which was lent to us by a friend, to whom it was presented by another. Perhaps it may have gone down since the time of the first purchaser. But the price seems rather steep, especially when we consider that the usual profits of "middlemen" and advertisers are pretty well done away with by the obligation resting on all Scientists to act in these capacities. For the following commands were issued from headquarters:

"It shall be the duty of all Christian Scientists to circulate and to sell as many of these books as they can.

"If a member of the First Church of Christ, Scientist, shall fail to obey this injunction, it will render him liable to lose his membership in this Church.

"MARY BAKER EDDY."

It is also notable in the very book itself that it is a matter of faith that no other book will answer the purpose. We are told distinctly that "a Christian Scientist requires my work *Science and Health* for his textbook, and so do all his students and patients." (*All* of them, mind you; even a patient's cure cannot be hoped for unless he himself buys the book. A mere reading of it will not suffice. He must *ponder* it, and let it sink into his mind.)

"Why does a Scientist require it?" she asks. "Oh, that is very simple.

"First, because it is the voice of Truth to this age, and contains the full statement of Christian Science, or the Science of healing through Mind.

"Second, because it was the first book known containing a thorough statement of Christian Science.

Hence it gave the first rules for demonstrating this Science, and registered the real Truth uncontaminated by human hypotheses." (In other words because it is a book inspired in every word, and of course nothing can take its place.)

But now, in a few words, the real cat is let out of the bag. "Other works, which have borrowed from this book without giving it credit, have adulterated the Science."

Other works, no matter how completely they state the "Science," *unless they give her book credit* (that is to say advertise it, and promote the profits accruing to Mrs. Eddy personally from its sale), adulterate the "Science." It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the "Science" does not consist in what is printed in the book, but in the science of how to make money out of it. To go on now to the third reason:

"Third, because this book has done more for teacher and student, for healer and patient, than has been accomplished by other books."

It is easy to understand why this should be so, because there are no other books which are allowed to be circulated by Scientists; and no one not at least an incipient Scientist is likely to circulate any books at all about this "Science."

In spite of all this she avers that "her prime object, since entering this field of labor, has been to prevent suffering, not to produce it." Well, we do not say that she wants to "produce" suffering; but it does seem that she was quite willing to let it go on, rather than to have it prevented or stopped by any other means. Let a person continue to suffer agonies from a toothache, for instance, rather than violate "scientific" principles by having a dentist interfere

with it. Of course, she does not prohibit anyone not a full member of her Church from weakening a little on its principles, for she knows of course that it would be useless to do so. But a fully approved member, whom she can control, must go on suffering; must just grin and bear it unless "science" comes to his relief.

In the end of this chapter, there is a concession which really is remarkable:

"If," she says, "from an injury or any other cause a Christian Scientist were seized with pain so violent that he could not treat himself mentally—and the Scientists had failed to relieve him—the sufferer could call a surgeon, who would give him a hypodermic injection, then, when the belief of pain was lulled, he could handle his own case mentally."

There are lots of things in this, which, in the words of Lord Dundreary, "no fellow can understand." In the first place, how could there be any injury to a Christian Scientist, or indeed to anyone whatever. "Injuries," at any rate if only material, as seems to be implied, really do not and cannot occur. If even one's leg seems to be cut off, it is only an "error of mortal mind." The leg is really as much there as it ever was. And then even if injuries did occur, there could not be any pain from them, at any rate to a full-fledged Scientist, as is supposed in the case.

Furthermore, what good could a hypodermic injection do? It would be only a "drug," and any real Scientist knows that drugs are also errors of mortal mind. Such an one could not have even a "belief of pain," and even if he had, how could hypodermic injections relieve beliefs? Surely not unless this alleged Christian Scientist believed in them too. And surely

that would be almost an incredible apostasy, which ought to turn him out of the Church at once.

Next after this chapter, comes another, which is headed

CHAPTER XIV.

Recapitulation.

There is not, of course, much hope of finding anything in this which is not in the previous chapters. But we might expect to find some condensation of what has been hitherto spread out and as it were diluted. Still, in glancing over the contents, we find some of the points to be pretty long, as if it was rather hard to boil them down into good and convenient form. A catechism, as this, one would think, ought to be intended for, would not be very practical in its present shape. The questions in it are short enough, but to remember the answers must be rather a strain on the memory, as they sometimes spread over several pages.

The first three questions, and the answers too, are quite brief and are fairly correct, though the words are not used in their proper and accepted meaning. But time and space are too valuable to bother much about a comparatively little thing like that. We can put it down to a want of mental and verbal training. But these three questions being asked and answered, the nonsense begins to appear. The fourth question is: "What are spirits and souls?" The answer begins as follows: "To human belief they are personalities, constituted of mind and matter, truth and error, good and evil."

"If human belief" means the belief of human beings, this is a very strange statement. We have

never heard of even a single human being who had the notion that spirits or souls were constituted of mind and matter. No human being whom we have ever met had any idea that a spirit or soul had any matter in its constitution at all. As to its being a mixture of "life and death," such a weird idea cannot even be understood by an ordinary sensible human being. No Christian, at any rate, believes that the human soul, in itself, dies. Indeed the word "death" has no meaning, strictly speaking, as applied to it by itself. What Christians believe is that the human soul is during life (as we commonly understand the word) in union with a material body, which serves as a means of communication for it with the rest of the material world. Why the body should be needed for this purpose, we do not know; but as a matter of fact, we know that normally or regularly it is. What is meant by death is simply the breaking off of this normal or regular communication. It is as absurd to speak of a human soul as being constituted of life and death, as it would be to speak of a man as being constituted of "living at Boston and leaving Boston." Similarly, it is as absurd to speak of the soul as being "constituted of truth and error," as it would be to speak of a schoolboy as being constituted of adding up a column of figures right and adding it up wrong. The soul may be correct in its beliefs or opinions, or it may be incorrect in them; that is all that the words mean. But it isn't "constituted" of correctness and incorrectness, and can't be both correct in any definite opinion, and incorrect in it, at the same time.

In the next sentence, our learned Prof. Eddy tells us that "there is no finite soul or spirit." Though this is evidently and absolutely false, still we must not

quarrel with it just here; for of course it is merely a statement of opinion.

The next question of the catechism is: "What are the demands of the Science of Soul?" We will mark the questions in order; so this will be Question 5, the first three not needing special notice.

There really is not much in this, except a repetition of the materialist idea of the quart and the pint-pot. "The belief," we are told, "that the greater can be in the lesser is an error that works ill." Then comes an unintelligible remark that "this is a leading point in the Science of Soul, that Principle is not in its idea." We thought that Principle was everything, but now it seems it is excluded from the "Science of Soul." Next, "we reason imperfectly from the effect to cause, when we conclude that matter is the effect of Spirit." Just how the imperfection of the reason comes in, Dr. Eddy does not deign to show. She says, however, that "*a priori* reasoning shows material existence to be enigmatical." It is quite true, as we have stated in the beginning, that it is "enigmatical," if by that is meant "not perfectly intelligible." But that does not prevent it from being a fact, thoroughly ascertainable by the senses by which God manifests it to us. Then comes the old stuff, that "matter neither sees, hears, nor feels," as if somebody had said that it did. Of course it does not see, hear or feel; but it is the means which God has provided to enable spirit to become aware of its existence.

Question 6. "What is the scientific statement of being?"

Answer. "There is no life, truth, intelligence, nor substance in matter. All is infinite Mind, and its infinite manifestation for God is All-in-all.....Spirit

is the real and eternal; matter is the unreal and temporal."

Real and unreal are good words to use to pull the wool over people's eyes; but it would be gratifying to have Prof. Eddy give a clear definition of them.

Question 7. "What is substance?"

Answer. "Substance is that which is eternal and incapable of discord and decay."....."Spirit, the synonym of Mind, Soul, or God, is the only real substance."

In other words, pantheism is the true doctrine.

Question 8. "What is life?"

Answer. "Life is divine Principle, Mind, Soul, Spirit."

Yet, just now, we were told that "it is a leading point in the Science of Soul, that Principle is not in its idea."

Question 9. "What is intelligence?"

Answer. "Intelligence is omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotence."

We begin to see now why Dr. Eddy has no intelligence.

It is just because she is not omnipresent and omnipotent.

Question 10. "What is Mind?"

Answer. "Mind is God.....There can be but one Mind, because there is but one God, and if mortals claimed no other Mind and accepted no other, sin would be unknown."

For mortals to claim the Divine Mind, seems to be rather a big claim, except, of course, in the case of our Professor; but as to accepting no other, the rest of us have to be content with what God has seen fit to give us.

Later in this "answer" the Doctor says that "the supposed existence of more than one mind was the basic error of idolatry." It really would seem to be just the other way. For if we have no mind except the "Mind of God," then "idolatry," which is the giving of Divine honor to man, or to something which he has made, would not be an "error," whether "basic" or of any other kind.

Another "gem" worth quoting appears toward the end of this answer. Dr. Eddy tells us that the "so-called senses receive no intimation of the earth's motions or of the science of astronomy."

Was the science of astronomy got at, then, by Divine revelation like Eddian science? We have always supposed that it was laboriously built on careful observations made by the senses.

Question 11. "Are doctrines and creeds a benefit to man?"

Answer. "The author subscribed to an orthodox creed in early youth, and tried to adhere to it until she caught the first gleam of that which interprets God as above mortal sense. This view rebuked human beliefs, and gave the spiritual import, expressed through Science, of all that proceeds from the divine Mind."

Well this certainly is rather a stunner. We had, previously, some kind of an idea that her pretending to be God was just a sort of formula, to which she had been driven by what she took to be logic. But now it seems that when she got her "gleam," she attained, at one leap, to a knowledge of "all that proceeds from the divine Mind." That was surely "some" gleam. The prophets did not begin to be in it with her. They only knew just a little, as much as God chose to reveal

to them. And then as to what we call natural knowledge, which we believe comes to us largely by the Divine illumination of our reason, it must have all come to her in a moment by this "gleam." She was, she must have been, familiar with all the researches, for instance, of the higher mathematics. Quaternions would have been mere child's play to her. In the *Mecanique Celeste* of La Place, he sometimes says, "thus we easily see so and so." Bowditch, who made a translation of this great book, said that when he saw this, he knew that he was in for a couple of days of hard work, and the using up of many pages of foolscap. But Prof. Eddy would have seen through the whole business at a glance.

It surely is a great pity that she did not give to some of us poor mortals some help in these studies that cost us so much labor. But no, she was too far above us. But she might have written something in these lines, for us to break our poor heads over. She could have given us the results, at any rate, even if we could not follow the steps; and they would have been quite useful, and we would have humbly accepted them, if they worked out all right, like those of La Place.

Question 12. "What is error?"

Answer. "Error is a supposition that pleasure and pain, that intelligence, substance, life, are existent in matter."

Really, Professor, it seems to us that these three ought not to be lumped together. "Intelligence" is not the same thing as either substance or life, and the last two differ from each other. And then you say that "error is a belief without understanding." If we believe this first statement of yours, then, we fall

into "error," because it is one which no one can possibly understand, as it has no definite meaning. If you had said that it was error to suppose that any one of these three were existent in matter, we should have had three different examples of "error." But in a definition, as this is supposed to be, to give examples instead of a definition hardly seems to fill the bill. It would seem better to say simply that "error" is the taking something as true, when it really is not so. But then we all know that; so of course we should not need to ask the question, or to get any answer.

Question 13. "Is there no sin?"

Answer. This question seems, if we may speak so irreverently, to be dodged by our learned Professor. She says that "the only reality of sin, sickness, or death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human, erring belief, until God strips off their disguise."

But we were not asking whether sin is what she calls, in her way of speaking, a "reality." The only sense of the question is, whether people ever do fall into the "unreality" which is commonly called "sin." They certainly are sometimes sick; otherwise her whole business of "healing the sick" would disappear. Of course their sickness may be an "unreality" or an "illusion;" but still the illusion is there, to be "healed." And the same about sin; the question is "do people fall sometimes even into this 'unreality,' as well as into that which we call sickness?"

Question 14. "What is man?"

Answer. "Man is not matter; he is not made up of brain, blood, bones, and other material elements." Nobody, except some non-Christian materialists, ever said that he was; so this seems to be needless. We

want to know what he is, not what he isn't. She goes on, however, to this: "Man is idea, the image, of Love."

We wish that we were; but sometimes man does not answer to this description. When one man murders another (which sometimes, Professor, really happens) he is more like the image of hate. The question is not what he ought to be, but what he actually is. You can't answer it by this high-sounding talk about "reality."

What you go on to say, that "he has no separate mind from God," is obviously and blatantly untrue. If it were true, he would never make a mistake, even in a small thing like adding up a column of figures; still less would he commit the "unreality" (as you call it) of sin. But she goes on, courageously, in the teeth of evidence. "Man is incapable of sin, sickness and death." If man is incapable of sin, sickness and death, why are you making such a fuss about healing the sick?

She says "the real man cannot depart from holiness." If this is so, all we can say is that up-to-date the number of real men, in all history, can be counted on the fingers of one hand. The only ones that anyone feels sure of are our Lord Himself, His Blessed Mother, and St. John Baptist. Why don't you say the *ideal* man, instead of the *real* man? That is what you really mean. And why do you, who call yourselves "Scientists," pay attention to this nonsense, which contradicts our own interior science or knowledge of yourselves?

But it is not simply and merely nonsense. It is a very dangerous kind of nonsense. The doctrine of "total depravity," seriously held in the early days of

the Reformation, was bad enough, as representing that man could in no way attain to holiness; that he must to all eternity remain sinful, with his sins the same as ever, but ignored by the Most High, and hidden from His sight by the mantle of the righteousness of the Redeemer. But at least one expected not to add to his sins after death, and to be then really in peace, and in a way in union with God.

But this delusion is far worse, for it does not free one from sin, even in appearance. For it does not acknowledge its existence. It hides sin from our own sight as well as trying to hide it from that of God; and of course recognizes no responsibility in us for it, and consequently makes repentance for it impossible. It shuts the door of heaven in our faces. It also makes union with God for us impossible, by falsely asserting that we have it already; that we are not only in union with Him, but indeed identical with Him. Open your eyes, and see whose words these are, in whose steps the author of this false Science is treading. You will find them in the prophet Isaias (xiv. 12-15). "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, who didst rise in the morning!.....Thou saidest in thy heart; I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God.....I will ascend above the height of the clouds, I will be like the most High. But yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, into the depth of the pit." And our Blessed Lord confirms this sentence. "He that exalteth himself shall be humbled."

Question 15. "What are body and soul?"

Answer. Here the question asked seems again to be dodged, for no apparent reason. The Professor starts by telling us what "identity" is, but nothing

about "body." She does, however, deign, to say that "Soul is the substance, Life, and intelligence of man." Of course we have now learned enough "science" to understand that man has no intelligence of his own; that is the reason why he never makes any mistakes, or falls into error. It is only "mortal man" who does this; but as all men really are mortal (even the Professor herself, as events have shown) it seems of little use to tell us about any other kind of man. However, we know that when she writes Soul with a big S, she means God.

Now, however, comes something really startling: "Separated from man, who expresses Soul, Spirit would be a nonentity." But Spirit (with a big S) also means God. We learn, then, that separated from man, God would be a nonentity. But we are encouraged by hearing that there is no danger of this, for "man is coexistent with God." It is true that the Scriptures say (Gen. i. 27) that "God *created* man;" but what are they compared with *Science and Health?*

She proceeds to tells us that the ordinary kind of man (even the Professor herself) can have no evidence of Soul, that is to say, of God. "Man," she says, "has never beheld Spirit or Soul leaving a body or entering it." And of course, according to her materialistic ideas, which she jumps to whenever she thinks there is no need of pretending to denounce them, can have no evidence except that of the material senses. And this seems to be true not only of "mortal man," but of any possible kind of man. For she makes the last-quoted statement of "man" in the most general sense of the word. Even Mrs. Eddy herself is no exception to it.

This is a terrible result to get from our "science," that there is no God.

Question 16. "Does brain think, and do nerves feel, and is there intelligence in matter?"

Answer. Having no further use, just now, for her materialism, she immediately proceeds to attack it. But there is really no use in this, as far as her campaign against Christianity is concerned, for Christians have no idea that "brain thinks," or any of the rest of it.

There is no need, therefore, for us Christians to go into all the incoherent nonsense which she spreads out through her "answer." But there are some little "gems" of it, which stand out, as it were, from the rest.

For instance, she says, quite correctly, that "man is not God, and God is not man." But we have learned in the answer to Question 14 that "man has no separate mind from God;" and also, in many places, that his body is only an illusion. The difference, then, between man and God must be just simply one of size, as far as we can make out. Man *is* God, according to Dr. Eddy, but of course, on a small scale. The old "material" idea again.

Again, "God, or good, never made man capable of sin. It is the opposite of good—that is, evil—which seems to make man capable of wrong doing. Hence evil is but an illusion, and it has no real basis."

It is too bad that man should be hanged, or electrocuted, simply on account of an illusion. The jury ought to say, "Not guilty," every time. No basis even for any indictment.

Again, "Human hypotheses first assume the reality of "sickness, sin and death, and then assume the

necessity of these evils because of their admitted actuality."

The trouble with our learned Professor seems largely to have been that she got, somehow, a little smattering of philosophy, and that she found, or thought she found, in it the statement that evil had no existence, being merely a negation of good. This is, in a sense, true; it is like the statement in mathematics, that negative, or *minus* quantities, have no real existence, which is also true. But all the same, the operation denoted by them has a real significance.

In money matters, for instance, if a man owes a sum of money this is a "negative" asset, and just as real as a positive one. And this applies precisely to the matter of "sin." God has given us all that we have or can have. In return, we owe Him all the service we can give. We can never get on the credit or positive side of the account. Our Lord tells us (Luke xvii. 10): "So you also, when you shall have done all these things that are commanded you, say: We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which we ought to do."

But we have not, in fact, done all things that are commanded to us. We are, in other words, guilty of many sins of omission. We have, moreover, done many things which were distinctly forbidden to us or, in other words, are guilty of many sins of "commission." It is simply nonsense to say that there is no "reality" in all these sins. To deny that there is any reality in them is simply to add another sin, of falsehood, to the list. And to say, as she does, that "if sin is supported" (that is to say, the *fact* of sin) "God must uphold it," is to make the nonsense blasphemous, as well as false.

"In Science," we are told, "it is material sense, not

Soul, which sins." Prof. Eddy tries to escape from her nonsense, by spelling soul with a big S; which makes it mean that "it is not God Who sins." We all know that. But she really means that it is not soul which sins (with a small "s"); for soul is the same as Soul, according to her own doctrine. Trying to throw the blame on "material sense" will not work; there is no sense, "material" or otherwise, in doing so.

She tries to confuse herself and us by saying that "human thought has adulterated the meaning of the word *soul* through the hypothesis that soul is both an evil and a good intelligence, resident in matter." Whether it is "resident in matter" or not makes no difference. The worst sins are committed by souls whom no one claims to be "resident in matter." Spiritual sins (so-called because matter is not concerned in them) like those of the devils and also of many human beings, and of which the chief is "pride," are worse than any others.

What she calls a "hypothesis" is not a hypothesis at all, but an absolute and undeniable fact, with which "matter" is in no way involved. The existence of this evil intelligence in us, which is the cause of our innumerable sins, is testified to us by our conscience, which Mrs. Eddy endeavors to smother and blind.

This impudent error is practically the worst and most dangerous of all in her alleged "Christian Science." Fortunately, it is not, and cannot, thank God, be fully accepted by her "students" and probably was not, even by herself. But it does tend to give to anyone who tries to accept it a false and delusive sense of security, similar to that given by the doctrine of "total depravity," which taught that man, since the Fall, cannot help sinning all the time; and that the

more he sins, the more glory is given to the Redemption. This present error goes to the other extreme, by asserting that man cannot sin at all; that it is only a "material sense" which seems to sin, for which he is in no way responsible.

Neither of these doctrines can be thoroughly accepted by anyone. The one denies the possibility of amendment; the other that there is anything to be amended. "I believe it," said the old lady, about that of total depravity; "but I can't quite live up to it." And so it is with "Christian Science." But so far as they are accepted, they give a sort of false and delusive cheerfulness, which is mistaken by those who feel it, and may be by those who witness it in others, for a good and healthy state of things.

Question 17. "Is it important to understand these explanations, in order to heal the sick?"

Answer. The answer given has nothing in it which really needs to be noticed, as it has all been dealt with sufficiently before. It may, however, be remarked that the cheerfulness of which we have just spoken may be a factor in restoring health, just as it is in any other of the kinds of treatment to which Dr. Eddy alludes, by "drugs, hygiene or animal magnetism." A pleasant and cheerful doctor has the same effect, as everyone knows.

Question 18. "Does Christian Science, or metaphysical healing, include medication, material hygiene, mesmerism, hypnotism, theosophy or spiritualism?"

Answer. "Not one of them is included in it."

Well, we all know that. If you want to be cheerful, you must be "scientifically" so. Other means for the recovery of health must be rigorously excluded. "Drugs and hygiene," particularly, "because they op-

pose the supremacy of the divine Mind." They were not made by the divine Mind; whoever made them only Prof. Eddy ever knew, and now that she has gone, there is no one to tell us. It is like the story of the professor who once, for fun, asked a stupid boy, "What is electricity? (A question, which no one is, as yet, able to thoroughly answer.) The poor boy, thinking it must have been in his book, somewhere, replied: "I did know, professor, but I've forgotten." "Well," says the professor, "that is an irreparable loss to science. You were the only one who ever did know, and now even you have forgotten."

Question 19. "Is materiality the concomitant of spirituality and is spirituality, and is material sense, a necessary preliminary to the understanding and expression of Spirit?"

Answer. We are at a loss to understand why the learned Professor asks this question. For she herself tells us that "material sense" is an absurd phrase, and in her meaning of the word everyone not a thorough-going materialist, such as have apparently been her chief associates, agrees with her.

There are one or two "gems," however, in her "answer," which may help to the main object of Eddian Science, by helping toward cheerfulness and hilarity. One is that "man never dies. The belief that he dies will not establish his scientific harmony." Mrs. Eddy tried to keep up her scientific harmony by not yielding to this belief. But at last even she had to give it up as a bad job. But the rest of us seem to keep it up pretty well, in spite of this inevitable belief.

Again she says "there is more Science in the perpetual exercise of the Mind-faculties than in their loss." It seems that this must really be so, and that

this must be the trouble with Mrs. Eddy's alleged "Science."

Question 20. "You speak of belief. Who or what is it that believes?"

Answer. "Spirit is all knowing; this precludes the need of believing."

Well, if we know, it is quite true that we don't need to believe. But the comment of the illustrious exponent of common sense, Josh Billings, would be well for Mrs. Eddy to have pondered; namely, that "it is better not to know so awful much than to know so much that ain't so." This applies to a good many things that pass with the public under the name of "science" at the present day; but to none more than to the Eddian variety.

Question 21. "Do the five corporeal senses constitute man?"

Answer. As nobody says that they do, the answer seems to be rather superfluous. But there is a "gem" of the first water in the Professor's answer.

She says that "when the unthinking lobster loses its claw the claw grows again." So she feels sure that if she could only manage to be "unthinking" enough (she does go pretty far in that way), she might grow a claw herself. She doesn't merely believe this, she *knows* it. "If the Science of Life were understood," she actually says, "the human limb would be replaced as readily as the lobster's claw. Not with an artificial limb, but with the genuine one," she assures us. But why not with a claw, if that were preferred? Or with a new brain, which might, in spite of her theories, be convenient for some people.

You can't very well reach greater heights of nonsense than this. But she wanders on to variations,

like a musical composer, when he has an appropriate theme, or "motif," as we believe the slang is to-day. It is a pity, however, to spoil such a gem as this with any kind of setting.

Question 22. "Will you explain sickness, and show how it is to be healed?"

Answer. For this question the answer is not given. We are told that "a full answer to it requires teaching, which enables the healer to demonstrate and prove for himself the Principle and rule of Christian Science or metaphysical healing." Metaphysical healing means, of course, according to the learned Doctor's idea, healing without "physic." So we are forbidden to use any kind of physic, even when we know that it will give the result desired. If, for instance, we have taken any kind of poison, we must sooner die than take an emetic, though we may know that in this way we can get it off the stomach. Take a good dose of Christian Science, and the stomach will be relieved at once.

"Mind," she says, "must be found superior to all the beliefs of the corporeal senses, and able to destroy all ills." It *must* be found so. But she does not say, in a case like the one just mentioned, what is to be done if it *isn't* found to be so, in fact. Well, the patient must die, that is all. For there isn't time, in such a case, to go on fooling indefinitely. The patient must offer himself as a sacrifice to "the idea of Truth." For we are told that "if sickness is true or the idea of Truth" (that is, if we are truly sick), "you cannot destroy sickness, and it would be absurd to try."

Question 23. "How can I progress most rapidly in the understanding of Christian Science?"

Answer. "Study thoroughly the letter and imbibe

the spirit .....In the Science of Mind, you will soon ascertain that error cannot destroy error."

But how soon? In urgent cases, you must "imbibe the spirit in a few moments." So you will probably have to call in some other "practitioner," who has already managed to imbibe it at his leisure. Don't try to be one yourself, till you have made a thorough fool of yourself, for you may be standing in the way of others, who have already become so.

Question 24. "Have Christian Scientists any creed?"

Answer. "They have not, if by that term is meant doctrinal beliefs."

Why not say any beliefs at all, without putting in the "doctrinal?" For of course no true Scientist can *believe* anything whatever. He *knows* it all. The Professor, however, condescends to give us what she says are "the important points, or religious tenets of Christian Science." The word "tenets" seems rather unfortunate. It is not usual to speak of "tenets" in matters of science. But the ones which are given are somewhat in the ordinary style in which "tenets" are given; particularly where it is stated in No. 5, that "we acknowledge that the crucifixion of Jesus and His resurrection served to uplift faith." Here we find "faith" again. This must certainly be a little slip, perhaps due to want of care in proof-reading at the beginning; and of course it was too late to correct it in later editions, like the one which we have. "Faith," except in Mrs. Eddy, could be of no use, even to begin with.

The first "tenet" is also rather astonishing. For in it we find that "as adherents of Truth, we take the inspired word of the Bible as our sufficient guide to

eternal Life." But if it is sufficient, why did Mrs. Eddy write *Science and Health,* and sell it at a price so much higher than one has to pay for a fine copy of the Bible? And why oblige every Scientist to read it, and "imbibe it," while leaving them free, as regards the Bible, to read no more of it than she did herself?

Well, we have now waded through the "Recapitulation." It seemed at first as if it was going to be a sort of condensation of what had been given in the book. But it is really just the same sort of thing which we find in the rest of the book all through. The main points could really have been given in a form something like this:

1. There is nothing in the world except Mind (with a big M).

2. When I say "Mind," I mean God.

3. "Mind," or God, cannot put anything else in the world. Creation is quite impossible.

4. "Mind" is sometimes written with a small m. But that does not mean that there is any such thing as mind, with a small m, as differing from Mind with a large one. Mind (with a large M) could not create such a thing; it is an error to even imagine that It could. Mind with a big M is just the same as mind with a small one; only it begins with a big M.

5. In spite of what has just been stated, there is a kind of mind which does exist. It is called "mortal mind." It must exist, for it makes errors; which it could not make if it did not exist.

6. Of course there is no such thing as "matter." It is simply an "error of mortal mind."

7. As matter does not exist, there can be nothing really the matter with it. Sickness and death are, of course, also "errors of mortal mind."

8. There is no such thing as sin. It is a great error to think so, even for a moment. Of course "Mind" (with a big M) cannot sin; neither can "mind" (with a small m) do so, for it is all the same as "Mind" (with a big one). Not even "mortal mind" can sin; it can only make "errors," and of course is not to blame for them.

9. What Christ came for was to get rid of "mortal mind" and all its errors. The worst of all was the one about "sickness." The only way to get rid of them, and of "mortal mind" itself, is to study "Christian Science." But Christ Himself had only studied this noble science very superficially. Mrs. Eddy was the first one who really got a good grip on it. It is more correctly called "Eddian Science;" and would have been so-called, only that she was so humble, and also thought it would sell better under Christ's name.

10. "Eddian Science" is not a gospel for the poor, like that of Christ, but only for those who can afford to pay for it. It can only be learned from her own book, which you have to buy; you can't learn it thoroughly by borrowing the book. N.B.—The last of these ten points is far the most important. If one is a little shaky on some of the others, it doesn't make so much difference. But if one doesn't observe this one strictly, one is liable to be excommunicated.

We must pass on now to her very remarkable

"Key to the Scriptures."

This title certainly is calculated to excite great expectations. Others, before Mrs. Eddy, had put out similar works or, at any rate, works similar to what one would suppose this to be. The learned "Cornelius a Lapide" has supplied us with a commentary on the

Scriptures, giving the actual text of the books contained in them, accompanied by most copious notes and explanations, which are of great value to all students of the sacred volumes. This is, of course, a work which is much more voluminous than the Scriptures themselves; one of those which, like that of the great theologian Suarez, makes us wonder how in the world anyone could possibly have had time even for the manual labor required for it in the very longest life. And there are plenty of others, Protestant as well as Catholic, which are of that class, though perhaps none quite so extensive. The *Heavenly Arcana* of Emanuel Swedenborg is perhaps the one which seems to be more like than any other to that which we had a right to expect from Mrs. Eddy. It is a work of great ability, and has also a similar claim on our attention to what she has written; for Swedenborg also was supposed by himself and his followers to have a supernatural illumination which would make his teachings of incomparably more weight than his natural ability, great as it was, could possibly claim for them.

It is indeed evident, at the first glance, that Mrs. Eddy's "Key" was not intended to be, in point of size, anything like those which have just been mentioned, or indeed of quite the same character. And of course one does not expect a key to be as big as the door which it locks or unlocks. But one does expect that it is going to be of practical use for the whole door, not merely for a small part of it; or that if it is a key for a book, as in this case, that there it will furnish some general principles which can be applied to all parts of the book, to make all better understood. As there are only seventy-six of her pages in it, it would be admirably convenient and valuable if this

expectation were to be realized, and all the better for being so nice and small.

We have thrown out some hints in the course of the remarks made on the main portion of *Science and Health,* to which this " Key to the Scriptures " is appended, that any such expectations will hardly be gratified. Let us now just take a good square look at the " Key."

If we do so, we may (perhaps, if not as yet thoroughly familiar with the works of Prof. Eddy) be astonished to find that this " Key to the Scriptures " is not what we would suppose it to be at all when we get beyond the title. The only Scriptures on which any comment whatever is made are the first four chapters of the book of Genesis, and then, by a sudden leap, the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse (or Revelation), and a few scattered verses from the twenty-first chapter of the same. And even on these the only comment made, and the only notice taken of them, is in order to show that they do not mean what they seem to the unbiased mind to mean very plainly, but are simply dragged in to serve for notes, as it were, to the far more fully inspired book, *Science and Health.* To them, we don't know just why, one of the Psalms—the twenty-third in the King James version—is added. This appears, however, to be in order to put the word " Love " in capitals, in place of " The Lord," and the " He," subsequently referring to Him.

As to the chapters of Genesis, they are evidently needed for the use of Bible readers in general, that they may not be deluded by the idea that God created, or could create, anything at all. That idea would, of course, be fatal to the fundamental Eddian doctrine that there cannot be anything in the universe except

"Mind." Anything in the Scriptures which seems to be inconsistent with this is simply "the history of the untrue image of God, named a sinful mortal." Strangely, the writer of this book of Genesis, though Mrs. Eddy confesses that the Scriptures are inspired and "very sacred," does not seem to have suspected at all that it was anything at all but truth that he was writing; Mrs. Eddy lays the blame of its plain statements of what, according to "Science," is false, on the translators, who, she says, "entertained a false sense of being." But it is quite certain that the translators, who had far more reverence for the Scriptures than she had and were far better linguists than she, just translated correctly what they saw before them.

She can't be allowed to get out of her difficulty in that way, by charging the blame on the "translators." Of course she can, if she wishes, hold that the original writer did not know what he was writing or had written. And why not say at once that even he himself "entertained a false sense of being;" and that "Mind" Itself, which inspired him to write what he did, was quite willing that he should entertain this false sense and did not trouble him about it, knowing, of course, that Mrs. Eddy would clear it up in due time. It does seem strange that "Mind" or "Love," should allow "mortal mind" to be so fatally mistaken, when the error could so easily have been avoided. But nothing seems strange to Mrs. Eddy or her "scientists," which is in favor of her fads.

The other reason, of course, which is needed on account of these fads, for the incautious reader of these first four chapters, is that they must not be allowed to deceive anyone who may still be so wicked or stupid as to believe that our first parents, Adam

and Eve, committed any sin of disobedience to God. The whole account of the Fall is a "myth," she says, anyway; it is "a history of error, a dream narrative." As for sin, of course, if we are to believe her, it does not exist, and never did; there never was, can't be now, and never can be such thing. God, as she would have us believe in telling us this dream story of the Fall, was treating us as we sometimes treat children when we say to them "once upon a time," etc. Perhaps it may be doubted whether it is quite right to tell these stories, even to children, but probably we may be justified by believing that they do not take them to be real accounts of fact, much more than we take the ordinary novel to be so. But here we find God, "Mind, Truth, and Love," to be palming off on us a story which He knows we will take as a record of fact, and which will make us (according to Mrs. Eddy) to fall into most dangerous errors; and not correcting our false impressions about it for several thousand years; and then only by a really ignorant woman, whom most people would hardly take seriously. Of course, if she held that the story was simply one got up by "mortal mind," we would only be surprised that God should have allowed us to be deceived by it; and if she did not believe in God at all (it sometimes seems as if she didn't) there would be nothing to be surprised at, at all. But no; she takes the story as being Divinely inspired.

She makes a remark on Genesis iii. 11, 12, which really fits her own exactly. "Here," she says, "there is an attempt to trace all human errors directly or indirectly, to God or good, as if He were the creator of evil." This hits the nail right squarely on the head.

There is one idea which runs right through this "Key," as through all the rest of her book, which really is very hard to account for. It is, more than any other, the "straw man" to whom we have so often had occasion to allude. It is the "belief" (which must, as we suppose, have been prevalent among those whom she had happened to meet) "in material life and intelligence," which she says, "is growing worse at every step." It is one which the great majority of Christians never even heard of. But we have said, perhaps, enough about it already. "This is the error," she says, "that mortal man starts materially, that non-intelligence becomes intelligence." One little sentence, which she seems to think will knock the "inspired writer" thoroughly out, is worth quoting: "If, in the beginning," she asks, "man's body originates in non-intelligent dust, and mind was afterwards put into body by the Creator, why is not this divine order still maintained by God in perpetuating the species?"

Well, that belief of mind being afterward put into body, has been maintained, and may be by some even at the present day. But it is generally recognized by Christians now that the putting of mind into body does occur at the very earliest moment, so that abortion, from that very moment, becomes simply murder.

But the astonishing and incomprehensible thing is that this ignorant woman should presume to question the Almighty as to why or how He dares to change anything in His "divine order," at any rate without asking her permission. "Who will say," she proceeds, that "minerals, vegetables, and animals have a propagating property of their own?" Well, a good many people will and do say that about vegetables and

animals; and the most orthodox Christian, who really believes that God is almighty, and not under the orders of Mrs. Eddy, will believe and say that God can and does give that power, under His own direction, to vegetables and animals, just as easily as He gives the power of gravitational attraction, and many others, even to minerals.

But as she seems to have entertained a suspicion that some might actually hold these outrageous views, she gets quite furious, and indignantly asks: "Who dares to say either that God is in matter or that matter exists without God?" Well, no one of course, who is in terror of being excommunicated as not a genuine Scientist. That would be almost as bad as not buying her book, or not promoting the sale of it. But she lumps two things together which are as far apart as the poles. Every reasonable person believes that God, that is to say His power, is in matter. No reasonable person, whatever, believes that matter exists without God.

There is one passage or "word" in this "Key," that is so rich that we must really quote it in full: "According to this narrative" (that of the formation of woman) she says, "surgery was first performed mentally and without instruments; and this may be a useful hint to the medical faculty. Later in human history, when the forbidden fruit was bringing forth fruit of its own kind, there came a suggestion of change in the *modus operandi*—the man should be born of woman, not woman again taken from man. It came about, also, that instruments were needed to assist the birth of mortals. The first system of suggestive obstetrics has changed. Another change will come as to the nature and origin of man, and this revelation will destroy

the *dream* of existence, reinstate reality, usher in Science and the glorious fact of creation, that both man and woman proceed from God and are His eternal children, belonging to no lesser parent."

We should have thought that this was a sort of labored joke, if we had not observed that Mrs. Eddy never jokes, but is always in dead earnest. We have indeed heard that no Christian Scientist can even see a joke. Probably it is forbidden in their rules, somewhere, though it doesn't seem to be laid down in *Science and Health*. This, at any rate, really is a joke, even if the grave and learned Professor did not mean it as such; almost as good as the one we came across not long ago about the lobster and his claw.

But here, quite near to it, is something which is very far from being a joke. "That Adam," she says, "gave the name and nature of animals, is solely mythological and material." This is a deliberate perversion of Scripture, made in order to make it tell a lie. Scripture only says that the animals were named by Adam. But this woman slips in the words "and nature" after "the name" just to prove that Scripture is solely "mythological;" that is to say, that we are not to take it seriously, when it doesn't suit Mrs. Eddy. Oh, this kind of talk is simply preposterous. When I give a dog a name, am I supposed to change his nature? Even when I call Mrs. Eddy a Professor, that does not make her so. But that the names given to animals by Adam had any significance or connection with their nature, there is no reason to suppose.

As another little slap at taking Scripture seriously, Mrs. Eddy remarks that "the purpose of the Hebrew allegory, representing error as assuming a divine character, is to teach mortals never to believe (what

Mrs. Eddy says is) a lie." We have had to put in the words in parenthesis, to make it clear what she really means.

It is pretty hard to have patience with her unblushing and unscrupulous misrepresentations of fact, made in order to get some credit for her absurd and empty "science." For example, she says that "it is only mortal man, and not the real man, who dies." She wants to give the impression that the regular Christian teaching is that the soul of man is destroyed when it leaves the body, and to claim as a special doctrine of Christian Science that it does not. But she does this sort of thing continually. It is time for us to speak a little more plainly about this sort of thing than, perhaps, we have spoken before.

Mrs. Eddy knew, when she wrote this book, that orthodox Christians teach and believe that man is not simply material or produced by matter; that he is created by the Almighty to know Him, love Him, and serve Him in this world, and to have his true joy and happiness in that knowledge, love and service in this world, and if faithful unto death in these, to have this joy and happiness increased inconceivably after death. She knew that all Christians regard man as immortal, just as truly as she ever thought of doing. She knew all this because she had been taught it by her own good parents; she had never heard from them or from any other Christian a single word to the contrary.

But because it would suit better her purpose of getting up a new theory about "healing the sick," she wants to make her students and her readers in general believe that we are simply materialists; that we regard matter as being the origin of all phenomena, and even that we believe God to be a merely material

being; and that its laws, instead of being the expression of His holy Will and Wisdom, are, in our opinion, necessary and immutable. Because we refuse to regard it or anything else that He has created as essentially bad and unworthy to exist, she insists that we make it self-existent; and because we will not put "immortal man" as having a being identical with that of God, and as having no intelligence of life *given* to him by his Creator, but as having been from all eternity a mere reflection of God, or, if you will, an eternal emanation from Him, she pretends that we do not believe in his immortality at all.

It is possible, indeed even probable, that this pretender to science had lost faith in real Christianity, and that she had a very imperfect knowledge of even what she had learned about it; but she did know that no Christian denomination holds or teaches what she calumniously pretends that all Christians do. She had not a very brilliant intellect, but she was not stupid enough to believe her own lies. And of course that makes them absolutely inexcusable.

But having determined on this programme of misrepresentation of the known truth, she unhesitatingly perseveres in it to the end, and claims a patent on all that true religion has taught from the beginning of the world, as if she were the discoverer of it, in order to give her own absurd vagaries the benefit of its protection. After getting through with the small portion of the book of Genesis which she thinks can be made to serve her purpose of misrepresentation, she indulges in a lucubration on things in general, without any regard whatever to anything except her own false notions, or rather the false notions which she hopes her "students" can be induced to adopt.

To illustrate more fully the falsehood which is the keynote of this programme, one or two specimens may be quoted, though perhaps enough have already been given.

For one instance she calmly asserts: "Vertebrata, articulata, mollusca, and radiata are mortal and material concepts classified and are supposed to possess life and mind." Life in a certain sense, yes; that is, that God has implanted in them certain powers, and laid down certain laws or methods of action, which He could change or destroy at any moment if He should so will. But as to "mind," there is not, as she would try to make us believe on her word, that there is a single person who has any notion at all, that any of the general or species of animal life which she names possess "mind" at all. To say or to imply that anyone whatever supposes that they have it, is simply a lie, and she must have known that it was, when she wrote it.

Then again: "These false beliefs will disappear when the radiation of Spirit destroys forever all belief in intelligent matter." But no one whatever has, or ever had, any "belief in intelligent matter," even in that small portion of it which is under the direct control of the human intelligent mind. If she had found anyone, as she could have easily done (for anyone whatever would do) who said that he did not believe in intelligent matter, she would have explained, "just see what progress Christian Science is making even among those who are not regularly studying it. Just see how far the radiation of Spirit has reached already!"

But this sort of thing is too sickening and disgusting to keep on indefinitely in quoting examples of it. And they are to be found in almost every paragraph. She

seems to have gone on the principle that if she threw enough mud, some of it would stick.

There is one little gem, however, which may be worth while to mention, to relieve the monotony of this constant and persistent falsehood. "It is related," she tells us, "that a father plunged his infant babe, only a few hours old, into the water for several minutes, and repeated this operation daily, until the child could remain under water twenty minutes, moving and playing without harm, like a fish. Parents should remember this, and learn how to develop their children properly on dry land."

We should have suspected that Mrs. Eddy herself intended this for a sort of irrelevant joke, if we did not know that she never jokes. As for the "moral" drawn from this cock-and-bull story, it would seem that instead of the parents learning by it how to develop their children on dry land, they would, on the contrary, endeavor to teach them all this very valuable and practical accomplishment as early as possible.

Well, let us go on now to her absurd

Key to the Apocalypse.

We see, in starting on this, why it does not begin at the beginning of the book, and why it is practically restricted to one chapter of it. She had already told us in the part about Genesis.

"Genesis and the Apocalypse," she there remarked, "seem more obscure than other portions of the Scripture, because they cannot possibly be interpreted from a material standpoint." This seems as if she must have meant from a "Christian Science" standpoint. She says, it is true, that "to the author they are transparent, for they contain the deep divinity of the

Bible." If they were, all through, so "transparent," why did she keep this "deep divinity" all to herself, instead of giving us a little look at it? Oh, we see. It must have been because the divinity was too deep for us, so we have to be contented with the shallow divinity of Christian Science, which is given to us in the parts which she condescends to explain. Or wait a minute. We begin to see the point of this last story about the baby. She must have been the baby herself, and have been trained in infancy to stay in the transparent water for twenty minutes, and afterward learned to manage it for any length of time. But she does not think it prudent to try any such training on the rest of us; we had better, as she says, be kept on dry land.

So she begins on the Apocalypse with the first shallow water she finds in it, namely the one which tells about the little book, called *Science and Health*, which is easy for us to swallow right down, if we will only make a little effort. We have already had occasion to speak of this vision of St. John, in which Eddian Science was so clearly foretold, so we need not dwell on it now. This was in the tenth chapter; now she goes on to the twelfth, which tells us about the "woman clothed with the sun."

It is as plain as a pike-staff that the "scientific" explanation of this is that this woman was Mrs. Eddy herself. She does not want to say so right out, but she expects us, of course, to read between the lines. "The Revelator," she tells us, "saw also the spiritual ideal of a "woman clothed in light, a bride coming down from heaven, wedded to the Lamb of Love." Mrs. Eddy is the spiritual idea; she is the bride. She thinks it will look better to pass it on to Christ; but

anyone can see that it applies to her much better. Besides, He is called in the Gospels the Bridegroom, and everyone knows that in a wedding the groom cuts a small figure compared with the bride. Just as Christ was a very imperfect student of Science, which was only fully understood by Mrs. Eddy.

"As Elias," she says, "represented the idea of the fatherhood of God, which Jesus afterwards manifested, so the Revelator completed the figure with woman, typifying the spiritual idea of God's motherhood." But, of course, that must also have been manifested in somebody. And who could that somebody be but Mrs. Eddy? Who would *dare* to say it was somebody else, or that it had not yet been manifested, now that Divine Science has been fully brought to light in her book, *Science and Health?* That book contains the final word of Mind to mortal man. It is, moreover, far ahead of the Gospel, for no one, we believe, is allowed to make any comments on it, at any rate so far as she can prevent such a thing from being done. For her Precursor, she seems to have selected St. John the Apostle, so far as we can make out.

As for the serpent in the Garden of Eden, which, we are told, "from Genesis to the Apocalypse typifies sickness and death," as well as other evils (though just where we are not told), he is perpetually close upon the heel of harmony, and pursues with hatred the spiritual idea. He also of course typifies "mortal mind." In the Apocalypse he seems to have grown amazingly, and becomes a "great red dragon," which poor Mrs. Eddy has to tackle, as no one previously, even Christ Himself, was able to prevent his growing to that size. Of course, St. John, the "Revelator" or Precursor, did not mean that he had got to that size

when St. John wrote the Apocalypse, but that he would be when Mrs. Eddy was to appear and knock him out.

But what, more precisely, does this red dragon typify or symbolize? We learn from the "Key" in another place, that he symbolizes "the belief" which Prof. Eddy has got on the brain, but which can hardly be found elsewhere, "that substance, life, and intelligence can be material." In other words he is a sort of straw dragon, like the straw man, which she so often fights. We can't quite see, though, how she imagines him to have got so big in these recent times. No sensible person, at any rate at present, believes intelligence to be material, and no religious person has any idea that matter is the basis of substance or life.

The dragon's ten horns, as we learn from the same infallible authority, "typify the belief that matter has power of its own;" but no one who believes in God at all has any such idea as that. Mrs. Eddy, however, never knew very much about Christianity, and seems to have soon forgotten what little she had learned.

These horns, she tells us, also typify the belief that "by means of an evil mind in matter the Ten Commandments can be broken." We can't quite get rid of the belief that the Commandments not only can be, but that they sometimes have been broken, and even by Mrs. Eddy herself; since one of them is "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." But we never came across the idea that an evil mind must be *in matter,* for this breaking to be done. We had the impression that an evil mind was enough, all by itself. But perhaps Mrs. Eddy thinks that to break them, one needs some "matter" to do it with; so that she is fairly safe, as long as she does not believe that there

is any such thing; for then it is no matter what she does.

Well, it is not worth while to bother any longer with this absurd "Key." Of course it is vain to show its absurdities up to those who have made up their minds to take Mrs. Eddy as the great prophet, for whom the world has been waiting all this time; but those who have not yet surrendered their reason to her delusions may perhaps be warned against doing so while there is yet time; and it would seem that enough has been already said for that purpose.

In concluding this examination of what may be called the theoretical part of the book, which probably has not been very attentively studied even by its most thorough "students," it seems hardly necessary to say much about what the author gives us for a "glossary" to it. Still, there are some points or definitions in it which may show up her defiance of Scripture and the old solid Christian faith even more plainly.

It is strange to observe the malice which she has accumulated against poor Adam our first parent, and the vials of wrath which she pours forth on his devoted head in this "glossary." Here is the definition of him in Eddian Science.

The meaning of Adam, it seems, is "Error; a falsity; the belief in 'original sin,' sickness, and death; evil; the opposite of good—of God and His creation; a curse; a belief in intelligent matter" (the irrepressible straw man again), "finiteness, and mortality; 'dust to dust;' red sandstone" (why such a special spite against this, any more than other kinds of stone?) "nothingness; the first god of mythology, not God's man, who represents the one God, and is His image and likeness" (though that is precisely what the Scrip-

ture tells us Adam was); "the opposite of Spirit and His creations" (though the Scripture expressly tells us that God created him); "that which is not the image and likeness of good, but a material belief, opposed to the one Mind, or Spirit." Well, she goes on with more of the same blasphemous raving, but this is perhaps enough; but there is a little group of straw men at the end, at which she charges full tilt, like Don Quixote against the windmills.

"The name Adam," she says in her blind and unreasoning fury, "represents the false supposition" (made by nobody) "that Life is not eternal, but has beginning and end; that the infinite enters the finite" (repeating her materialistic and spatial ideas, which she simply cannot shake off); "that intelligence enters into non-intelligence, and that Soul dwells in material sense; that immortal Mind results in matter, and matter in mortal mind; that the one God and creator entered what He created, and then disappeared in the atheism of matter." One can just see her when writing this insane paragraph, grinding and gnashing her teeth at her own wild imaginations. Well this is enough to effectually prevent, it would seem, anyone who has any knowledge of real Christian teaching from reading any further.

It is amusing, however, to find that the "serpent" does not catch it quite so badly as "Adam." "The first audible claim," we are told, "that God was not omnipotent." But if this is enough to constitute a "serpent," it would seem that Mrs. Eddy herself must be a kind of serpent, as she tells us that God is not omnipotent; not even powerful enough to create anything outside of Himself.

It is also a funny departure from the usual practice

of glossaries or dictionaries to find the same word defined in two entirely different ways. "Believing," for instance, is defined as "firmness and constancy," and also as "moral thoughts, illusion." One would think that the latter definition would suffice; for any sort of believing is, we have understood, entirely inconsistent with Christian Science. A Christian or "Eddian" Scientist does not believe; he knows everything. He isn't omnipotent, of course, for we are distinctly told that even "Mind" is not that, as we have just noted; but he is omiscient, at any rate; he is all right, as far as "knowing" is concerned.

Well, it would be too tedious to take up all these funny definitions, or even any considerable number of them. There are some few which have a glimmering of reason or truth in them, but the great majority of them are just of the same kind as the above. They appeal to a sense of humor, and are fine illustrations of wild Eddian vagaries; as anyone can see at a glance; but then we must remember that they are not meant for the public, but for the kind people that are built on those lines. There is quite a temptation for the rest of us to amuse ourselves with them to a moderate extent, for they really are as good as a farce; but we can't keep up the farce all the time, as a real genuine Eddian does.

So at last we can pass to the final chapter, which is entitled

CHAPTER XVIII.

Fruitage.

Surely it is about time, after all the flowerage with which the book so far has been filled, to get to some fruitage. One is naturally anxious to know what it

is going to be. It is evidently intended to give practical proofs of the efficacy of Eddian Science, or to show to us the glorious fruits that are gathered by the Eddian tree. And we find, in fact, that it alleges quite a number of "cures;" of "healings of the sick," which Eddian students have accomplished.

But right at the start, a weighty consideration unavoidably suggests itself to the reader. For these cures are given as being cures of real physical and material ailments or diseases. But if we have learned anything from the whole gospel of the "Science," it is that there are no such diseases; that there are merely errors or illusions of "mortal mind." In other words, these diseases were merely imaginary; and anyone who thought he was suffering from any of them was merely a hypochondriac, or, as the French say, a *malade imaginaire;* there was nothing really the matter with him at all. He had a more vivid imagination than most people have to imagine the disease and by this same vivid imagination he was able to imagine that it was no longer there.

Well, it is certainly a valuable art (or science, if you will) to be able to control the imagination so thoroughly. But it isn't "Eddian" Science. You can't say that there was not and could not have been anything really the matter, and then triumphantly assert that there really *was* something the matter, and prove by the testimony of the material senses (which, by the way, Mrs. Eddy says are always erroneous), that this something really was cured. If you feel sure that you were cured by Eddian Science, it follows that you can't possibly believe in any such Science for the future. Your cure, if it was really a true one, knocks Eddyism right on the head.

Poor Eddy herself got you into this scrape by foolishly and needlessly denying the reality of matter, and, of course, of all material disease. If she had only had sense enough to acknowledge the reality of matter, and been content to prove the control of mind (with a big M if you like) over it, she would have been all right. But no; she must needs, in misguided zeal for her nonsense, put her foot right down deep in it, away up to the knee; and there it has got to stay. Too late to take it out now.

Let us, then, proceed to take a look at some of the "cures," but remember, please, that the more genuine they seem to be, the more thoroughly Eddyism is refuted by them. The only way in which that noble science can possibly score is by the getting rid of some "error of mortal mind." The patient thought that there was something the matter with him, and finds out that really there wasn't, except that he was mistaken; he was, in fact, just the same before the "cure" as he is after it. Of course there is no need to get testimony to a thing like that. The cure was simply a change of his state of mind, and his word is quite enough for that.

To make it clear, however, that we are not shutting our eyes to evidence, and refusing obstinately from hatred or prejudice to look at the cases, let us take some of them in detail. One is entitled "A Case of Mental Surgery." It seems to have been furnished by a lady, but we are not sure; indeed in some ways it looks as if it was a mere man who was the sufferer, particularly, because of the office work of which it tells us; but, on the whole, the lady hypothesis is the more probable, and we shall adopt it. It tells us that "in May, 1902, going home for lunch, on a

bicycle, I was thrown from the wheel, and falling on my left side with my arm under my head, the bone was broken about half-way between the shoulder and the elbow. While the pain was intense, I lay still in the dust, declaring the truth, and denying that there could be a break or accident in the realm of divine Love, until a gentleman came to assist me, saying he thought I had been stunned."

Now let us look at the facts thus far presented. It really seems to the outsider that both the sufferer and the assisting gentleman were right in their diagnosis of the case; the former on theoretical grounds, the latter on those of observation. No examination seems to have been made, of either a professional or amateur character. As to the place of the supposed fracture, that was only determined, it would seem, from the pain being apparently located there.

To resume the narrative: "I was only two and a half blocks from home, so I mounted my wheel again, and managed to reach it."

This again seems to confirm the diagnosis thus far made. It is, perhaps, true that an expert cyclist might be able to mount a wheel with a broken arm, so that this of itself is not absolutely fatal to the reality of the injury.

On her getting home, the scientific character of the lady came out very strongly. She made no attempt to fix up the (imaginary) arm in any way, but simply asked her (imaginary) little boy to bring our (imaginary) textbook. The arm, boy, and textbook, couldn't, of course, have been composed of "matter" in any way; for matter, as all scientists know, has no real existence.

To continue: "He" (the purely spiritual little boy)

"immediately brought *Science and Health,* which I read for about ten minutes, when all pain left."

The evidence, so far, seems to the wicked scoffer to be quite clear, and to the effect that there was nothing the matter but a slight bruise, which ceased to be painful after a few minutes. She was only "about a half an hour late in returning to the office, this being my only loss of time from work."

She "said nothing to her family of the accident." But some friends were apparently told about it later, and "claimed," on good grounds, it would seem, "that the arm had not been broken, as otherwise it would have been impossible for me to continue my work without having it set, and carrying it in a sling until the bone knit together." But, of course, the patient, being a real scientist, would listen to no such nonsense as having "a bone knit together;" it could no more knit together than it could knit a stocking.

But at last one of her friends invited her to visit the office of a physician (not a metaphysician), where they were experimenting with an (imaginary) X-ray machine. "The physician was asked to examine my left arm to see if it differed from the ordinary. On looking through it, he said, 'Yes, it has been broken, but whoever set it made a perfect job of it, and you will never have any further trouble from that break.'"

This is really the only scrap of evidence to show that the arm had been broken at all. But the doctor, naturally, did not want to doubt the lady's word, as to what *had been* the case, and had not had any opportunity to look at the arm before. On being asked if he could tell where the break had been, he "pointed out the place as being slightly thicker at that point."

For all that he could tell, it might have always been that way.

In this case, then, it seems as if Eddian Science was right or nearly right. There was not much the matter to begin with, and what little was the matter could well afford to treat surgery, even of a mental kind, with proper contempt. It was a case, apparently, of the "kiss the place and make it well" order, such as we were all familiar with in childhood.

There are a few other "cases" which seem to be somewhat in the "surgical" order, perhaps the strongest one is one entitled "Fibroid Tumor Healed in a Few Days." The patient who writes about this—apparently another lady—says, to begin with:

"I was afflicted with a fibroid tumor which weighed not less than fifty pounds."

It is not explained how she found out how much this tumor weighed. As we are told that it did not come out all at once, so that it could be separately weighed, as it might have been if removed by an operation, there seems to be no way of determining this interesting point, unless the lady was weighed before she started to read *Science and Health,* and again after the cure was completed. It is not stated how long the interval was between these two events; we are only told that the tumor "began to disappear at once." But when did it finish disappearing? It strikes us that this is rather an important point. And then how was it ascertained that the tumor was "fibroid?" We are not told that any doctor examined it; nothing is said even about an X-ray in this case. And no doctor seems to have even said that such was his opinion.

And indeed there seems to be no evidence, expert, or otherwise, that it was a tumor of any kind. Boil

the evidence down, and it seems to be simply (if not mere guess work all the way through) that the lady lost fifty pounds, or thereabout, in some indeterminate time. The present writer has known of a case in which an adult person gained eighty pounds in a year, advancing from one hundred and thirty pounds to two hundred and ten. He afterward lost it in about the same length of time; but nobody imagined that there had been any tumor. The proof of it, as given in this case, seems to rest simply on "a continuous hemorrhage for eleven years" of the eighteen years in which the "tumor" was growing. But on Eddian principles, an apparent increase or decrease of weight would amount to nothing, anyway. There could not be any real weight in matter, as it has no real existence. Mind is the only thing that could possibly have any weight, or anything else. We are rather astonished that Mrs. Eddy allowed an account so obviously heretical as this to be put into her book.

We read, by the way, in another case, that a lady gained forty pounds in three months by simply reading *Science and Health*. In the case of our own friend, just mentioned, the increase in weight, it is true, was only half as rapid, being only eighty pounds in a whole year. And, strange to say, he never read *Science and Health* at all.

Here is a case which really should be quoted, and in it the opinion of the home doctor and also of a specialist is given: "My eyes were very bad, so that I sat in a darkened room for weeks together, most of the time in bed under opiates. The home doctor and a specialist said the disease of the eyes could not be cured, though they might help me for a while, and the

doctor said if I took cold I would become totally blind. My suffering was beyond telling. A clergyman called almost every day, and sat by my bed and wept, and my good, kind doctor shed tears many times."

It would seem from this account as if the clergyman and the doctor perhaps had an idea that weeping and shedding tears might by the exercise of their own eyes, help those of the patient; otherwise it might seem more appropriate to say some prayers or give some drugs. But it does look as if they had given up the case, from a spiritual as well as a material point of view, and took to weeping as a sort of last resort. It is, however, quite rare to find either a clergyman or a doctor who has tears so completely at command. But the weeping, as it would seem, also failed. Nothing proved to be of any use except Christian Science, by which the lady was "healed instantaneously." But it is not stated what the disease was. Perhaps it was a constant weeping, and that weeping had been tried as a sort of homœopathic treatment. But the cheering up given by Christian Science (which certainly does have that effect) turned out to be the thing.

Doctors do sometimes take matters too seriously; there is no doubt of that. A good friend of ours said that he had been told by a doctor that if he sneezed, he might become totally blind. (This is like what we just had, in the last case. This was a gloomy prospect; for one can't sometimes, help sneezing.) But that was a good while ago, and his eyes are, we understand, as good as ever, though that isn't saying much. And this one never tried Christian Science either.

It might be worth while to get up a list of people who had been "cured" without doing anything at all;

and also (even more important) of cases where even Christian Science failed to cheer them sufficiently. A good many Scientists, beside Mrs. Eddy, have, we fancy, died since her book was given to the world. Statistics on this point would be interesting. And this is a more important point than might at first appear. For in ordinary cases of miracles or supernatural cures, they are ascribed by Christians generally to a special interposition of God, which can seldom be expected; but Christian Science ought to work, as it professes to be a regular science, every time. It just works according to the regular nature of "Mind;" and that should be always the same. So it is the failures of it, not the successes, which should be looked on as extraordinary.

Another investigation, which would also be desirable, if it was possible, would be to find out how many sick people have been cured by ordinary medical treatment. According to the principles of Eddian Science, no effect whatever ought to be produced by such treatment. But, in point of fact, it would undoubtedly be found that, as a rule, it is successful. The failures in it are usually due to the difficulty of determining just what is the matter, especially when there are several organs out of order, and what helps one may harm another; or sometimes that there isn't much of anything the matter at all. Of course, there are cases which have got beyond the reach of medicine, or were so from the beginning; since for many diseases no natural remedy has yet been ascertained; especially for those unavoidably connected with old age. No natural means for prolonging life forever has yet or ever will be discovered.

But if we were to compare the number of cases which

have been cured, or the ultimate failure certain in every case averted for a very long time, by medical science, with those which even seem to be due to Eddian Science, there is no manner of doubt that the former number would be overwhelmingly greater than the latter. And yet this latter pseudo-science would have us shut off the aid of true and genuine medical science, so immensely effectual in practice, in order to give a chance for Eddyism to work.

This is a very grave and serious charge made by common sense and by genuine Christian faith against Eddyism. All real Christians know perfectly well that God may, if it be His holy Will, cure by supernatural means where natural ones, dependent on His laws for matter which regularly work, will fail. And we do not wait till it has been proved that they are going to do so. As soon as any disease is really serious, we ask Him at once to come to the help of the natural means which He Himself has established. And we do so more urgently, if it seems that they are going to be insufficient. But we do not "tempt" or try Him, by throwing away the gifts which He has given us. Nor do we neglect ordinary precautions against the natural effect of the laws which God Himself has made for matter, by yielding to the idea, which according to the Scripture Satan himself suggested to Our Lord, that the angels "shall bear thee up, lest perhaps thou dash thy foot against a stone."

Nobody, then, who has faith in God, objects to Eddyists, when they feel a reasonable and Christian confidence that God (or "Mind" as it is their fad to call Him) will help them, and especially that He will do so supernaturally when His natural means do

not suffice. And we know, from the long experience of all human history and particularly from the two thousand years of Christianity, that He has done so all along, and continues on innumerable occasions to do so, right up to the present time; and often, immensely often, in a most phenomenal way. No one, who is in possession of the facts of the case, has any idea that "the age of miracles has passed;" we see too many of them continually, and in the annals of the Church they are recorded by the thousand. Those of us who are Catholics expect them, and take them almost as a matter of course, on occasions when the glory of God seems to specially call for them. If "Scientists" would only look at those, for instance, worked at Lourdes, or at those recorded in the processes of canonization of the Saints, they would see how insignificant, both in number and in character, their own "cures" would appear. But we ask for them that God may be glorified before and among men, not that we may be relieved from the suffering which our sins deserve. And the nearer, spiritually, we may be to God, the more clearly does this former motive stand out in our minds.

The mercy of our good God, however, is so great that He does not insist on our emphasizing this right motive all the time, but is willing to show His mercy and His power on many occasions as a reward for faith in Him, however imperfect that faith may be, or however selfish our motives. Even if we have a notion that we have discovered a new "science," by which we have Him at command as it were, and can draw on Him to any extent whenever we wish, He may help us, especially in an unbelieving age like this, in order to inspire confidence in Him, when such

confidence, and even faith of any kind, has been lost by so many. If "Eddian Science," false as it obviously is to all reasonable persons, brings anyone back, even a step, in the right direction, toward true faith, He may sometimes allow it to succeed, as long as the success is not asked for as a formal endorsement of it. "Half a loaf," even for the good God, may be "better than no bread." If we depend on His help, however mistakenly, He may be willing to give it, as being better than not to depend on it at all; and may also bring us to look for it where it can be found so much more abundantly.

But, in itself, to look for it simply because God is able to give it, is really the same as it would be to go to a railway station to buy a ticket, having left all our money at home. To the poor, who have no money, such a favor might be granted; but to ask for a ticket, gratis, just on general principles of "love," would not usually be a success. Use what money you have to spare, first, would be the more reasonable rule, however philanthropic the ticket-seller might be.

But to return from this digression to the actual cases that we are examining. In many of them we find that a considerable amount of money had actually been expended or, at any rate, a considerable effort had been made for a cure by using material means for that end, before resorting to the help of so-called "Christian Science."

What we chiefly miss in these cases is a testimonial from the doctor himself, over his own signature, as to the nature of the disease which is reported as having been cured. Of course, Christian Scientists themselves are not very particular on this point, and would

not value such testimonials if they were obtained, for (if they have become thoroughly and interiorly persuaded of the truth of the theoretical part of Mrs. Eddy's science) they are perfectly sure that there could not possibly have been any real material body at all for the disease to exist in, so that whatever name the doctors chose to give to it would not be of the slightest importance. All doctors, as well as the unprofessional, are, of course, from a " scientist's " standpoint, the victims of innumerable errors of mortal mind; and any classifications which they may make of them have absolutely no scientific value. The patient's own judgment of any such error is just as good as that which any doctor can form; and indeed better, for he knows the symptoms himself so much better than he can describe them.

Still, it is told to us in many of the cases what the doctor (or perhaps several doctors) said was the nature of the disease; but, after all, this is only second-hand evidence, and the doctor (whose name, so far as we are aware, is never given) does not stake his professional reputation on it in the mind of the public. But, all the same, it would have been satisfactory to people in general to have a first-hand statement from the doctor in charge, such as the doctors at Lourdes are usually quite ready to give. Though firmly believing in the regular operation of natural laws, the Christian doctor does not necessarily shut his eyes to the possibility of the supernatural, and does not think that the natural would be disproved by it. And a good many of his patients have the same reasonable opinion.

But we fully appreciate the difficulty in the cases of Christian Science. It is quite awkward for a doctor

who still believes in the reality of matter, and of his own material science, and does not believe in miracles, to testify to what is understood as completely wrecking his science. The best thing, perhaps, left for him would be to give up his profession and his business, and become a "scientist" and a "practitioner" himself. But that would be quite a drawback to the value of his testimony, among those who are not yet Eddians, and for whose sake, principally, it is needed. So, on the whole, we don't wonder that the testimonials are not forthcoming. But we will try to get what we can in this line.

We have already gone over some of the cases of "fruitage." Perhaps the best way will be to take them up in order with some brief remarks on each, and a little more on some of them. It may be noted, once for all, that in no case is the name of the doctor, or the full name even of the patient, given.

Case 1.—"Cancer Healed." To this there is no medical testimony as to its being cancer at all. The statement to that effect is simply from the patient. The only thing about doctors is, "I had tried five of our local physicians, but with no relief, in fact I became much worse. I consulted a noted physician in Albany three times and used the medicines which he prescribed." Usually, in a case of real cancer, an operation has been considered the only effectual remedy. So it would seem that the dectors did not consider it as being such.

Case 2.—"Astigmatism and Hernia Healed." In this case no doctor appears at all.

Case 3.—"Substance of Lungs Restored." In this the only medical statement, as given second-hand by the patient, is that "my lungs were like wet paper,

ready to tear at any time." But no name was given, it would seem, to the disease which produced this strange state of things.

Case 4.—This is the one about the "fibroid tumor," which is the second one described at length, just now.

Case 5.—"Insanity and Epilepsy Healed." The doctors in this case have receded quite into the distance; but as the patient tells us that she was at one time an inmate of an insane asylum, it would seem that some physician must have had something to do with putting her there. It is also stated that while there, she had a number of "bilious attacks" and that no less than six doctors (!) pronounced them incurable. But somehow she got hold of *Science and Health,* and *some five years later* she was let out of the asylum. At one time, it is stated that she was "pronounced dying," in an epileptic fit, by the "doctor in charge." From this last phrase it looks as if that was when she was at the asylum. She had "had no fit or symptoms of any since the first week in May, 1914. She was given her liberty from the asylum *five months after this.*" This really does not look like a very convincing case.

Case 6.—"A Case of Mental Surgery." This has already been given. It was the first on which comment was made.

Case 7.—"Cataract Quickly Cured." It is a man who comes to the front this time. But even he only speaks vaguely of "many doctors," who called the disease "iritis and cataract." It appears that he was cured in the end by reading *Science and Health,* for no less than four hours together, one evening. He says that for some time previously he "could not read longer than a few minutes at a time, otherwise they"

(his eyes) "would smart severely." He does not, however, tell us the interval since the last occasion when they smarted severely and this four hours "stunt." After this, on the next day, the disappearance of the cataract was noted, not by a doctor, but by the wife of the patient. We are not told how long it was since a doctor or even his wife had last seen it.

Well, we don't scoff at this altogether; but it would be more conclusive if the facts just mentioned as omitted had been given. One ought to be rather particular about details, when it is claimed that sore eyes were cured by reading a book for four hours (from 7 till 11 P. M.) by gas-light. And it is strange that the patient's wife made no objection to his trying this rather dangerous experiment, and that neither one was thinking of watching it during its progress. To the profane outsider it would seem that the eyes must have improved somewhat before it began.

Case 8.—"Valvular Heart Disease Healed." In this there is no attempt to prove by medical testimony that there was any such disease at all. Of all diseases this is one of the hardest to be sure of for the unprofessional. And, moreover, it often improves by generally improving physical conditions. The present writer knows something about it, having had it, according to medical testimony, for about ten years. The only proof given of it in this case were "extreme nervousness, weakness, dyspepsia, and insomnia," neither of which he has suffered from at all, except from the third for a short period.

Case 9.—"The True Physician Found." In this case we are informed by the patient that "for seventeen years, I had suffered from indigestion and gastri-

tis in the worst form, often being overcome from a seeming pressure against the heart. I had asthma for four years, also had worn glasses for four years. It seemed to me that I had swallowed every known medicine to relieve my indigestion." It may be that this last was the principal cause of the trouble. We quite agree with Prof. Eddy that this promiscuous drugging, especially with patent or advertised medicines, is one of the most dangerous "errors of mortal mind," and likely to lead to many others.

Finally this patient (a man also this time) got hold of Mrs. Eddy's "grand book," and "was completely healed of all my physical ailments in about two weeks time." He also tells us: "I have used no medicines from that day to this, and with God's help, and by the wonderful light revealed to me through the reading of Mrs. Eddy's book, I never expect to again." And then, inadvertently, he lets what may be the cat, after all, out of the bag, "I used to smoke eight or ten cigars a day." It would seem that this, on top of all the drugging, might be quite sufficient to account for all the symptoms, unless one had a remarkably good constitution. No regular doctor appears in this case at all.

It is rather amusing to find this gentleman quoting in the end the proverb "Physician, heal thyself," as if it was a recommendation given by Our Lord to those who were hearing Him, and in favor of "Christian Science." He just calls it a "Scripture saying," without stopping to look at the context.

Case 10.—"Cancer and Consumption Healed." In this we learn (from the patient herself, not from any physician) that she "was a great sufferer for many years from internal cancer and consump-

tion." She says, indeed, that she was treated by the best physicians in New York, Minneapolis and Duluth, and was finally given up as incurable." But it is not alleged that these physicians said that she had "internal cancer and consumption." There are cases which are incurable because the notions of the patient about them are incurable. But she seems finally to have shaken them off by means of Mrs. Eddy's book. It is undoubtedly good for such cases. The "patient" seems to have really had a very good constitution, for she tells us that she had a painless childbirth; it seems to have occurred when she had got "Science" well soaked into her system, and the mistaken idea about "cancer, etc.," thoroughly eliminated.

Case 11.—"A Remarkable Case." This one does seem more remarkable than the usual kind, because the trouble which was cured, that of a little boy (we are not told the precise age), and because he did not read *Science and Health* himself; his mother read it for him, and much of the time, as it appears, just silently to herself. She had some difficulty in getting the book, it seems, naturally enough not caring to buy such an expensive one, if she could get a loan of it from somebody; and as she was not yet in the church, she was not obliged to buy it. She says: "I never saw anyone part so reluctantly with a book as my friend" (presumably a regular member of the church) "did with her copy of the textbook." This confirms the idea we have had, that lending it must be against the rules; but if we are mistaken we shall be glad to be corrected. Perhaps it is only that every "Scientist" is under an obligation to read a definite amount of the "textbook" daily, like that of a priest to say his office every day from his breviary; so that it would

not be convenient to let it go altogether for twenty-four hours.

The lady read the book, we are told, "silently and audibly, day and night," and though she "could not seem to understand it, yet the healing commenced to take place at once." This matter of not "understanding" the book is really mysterious; we meet with similar statements now and then. But perhaps it is meant that she could not understand how it could be a Christian book, the difficulty in doing so would be easily understood, since it contradicts the Bible and the plain teachings of Christ and His Apostles on almost every page, as we have already seen.

"About this time," she tells us, "we decided to move to the West." It is stated that "throughout the journey, we were the only ones in our car who did not get train-sick." Rather a sickly car, it seems. Getting "train-sick," one would think, would be more extraordinary than not getting so. The present writer has crossed the continent back and forward four times, and never met with anyone who was "train-sick." But perhaps, on this occasion, the train pitched and rolled more than usual. Immediately after this it is stated that "the child's limbs grew perfectly straight, he ate anything he wanted, and for years he has been a natural, healthy child in every way."

If his limbs were crooked before beginning the journey, and grew perfectly straight before finishing it, that certainly would be well worth mentioning. But it appears that even before starting on the journey, he was "playing and romping about the house as any child should;" and that for years he has been all right. There seems to be nothing conclusive to show that he did not just naturally outgrow his complaints.

The lady proceeds to her own case, which seems to have been chiefly one of trouble with her eyes. "One of the leading oculists in Boston told her that her eyes 'were in a dreadful condition,' and that she would always need to wear glasses." Almost needing to wear glasses does not seem to indicate any "dreadful condition" of the eyes. Of course the lady's age is not stated. But the present writer had to begin wearing glasses at the age of forty, about the usual age for beginning, and has worn them for some thirty years since; gradually, of course, having to make them stronger for reading purposes. This is just the normal course of things, from the gradual flattening of the lens of the eye. Sometimes, however, there is a recovery for a time; and of late, for quite a number of years, the change for the worse may almost cease.

At the end of this testimonial, vague and non-medical as it is on the whole, we find, however, what is certainly a startling statement. It is that "teeth have been restored, and facial blemishes removed, unconsciously, simply by reading *Science and Health.*" What is meant by teeth being "restored?" Does it mean that teeth which had absolutely gone have come back? If so, it should have been stated more unequivocally. But if it means restored to comparative usefulness, the present writer can testify to that, and has not had a toothache for many years; and long before reading *Science and Health* at all. So we would like to have more detailed accounts on this matter. On the whole, however, we will confess that this case is beyond the average, quite considerably. It is, comparatively, a "remarkable" one.

Case 12.—"Intense Suffering Overcome." This case the doctors seem to have diagnosed as one of

sciatic rheumatism; another one "examined my heart and claimed that it was weak, and that I was liable to pass on at any time from heart trouble." Another one "said there would have to be an operation which would include the exposing and scraping of the sciatic nerve."

We know, personally, of a case in which this last process was recommended. But it was not actually performed. The patient got better, and the trouble did not last very long. But we are sure that he never read *Science and Health* at all. He had all his life occasional attacks of rheumatism, once at least of the "inflammatory" sort, and very severe. But of late he has had less than previously. *Science and Health* doesn't seem to have been needed.

Case 13.—This is another case of "sciatic rheumatism." But in this no doctor comes to the front at all. It seems to be that of a lady, as most of them are; but we are not sure; we will assume it, anyway, since she seems to have consulted principally with her sister. She thought she had Bright's disease, also. She "had never joined any church, and thought it now too late, as I would have to wait six months on probation, and I would be dead before that."

Her sister, she tells us, was already a "Scientist," and on making inquiries the patient "soon found that it was just what I had been looking for." She "commenced reading *Science and Health,* also the New Testament." Strangely, she does not seem to have noticed the incompatibility of the two. But then she was not looking for religion, but only to get physically all right. She discovered what all Christians were already aware of, that "God as revealed by Christ Jesus can do everything, that He made

everything that was made" (though *Science and Health* denies this), "that He can and does heal the afflicted;" and this well-known truth cheered her so much that the diseases troubled her no more.

As a testimony to the distinctive teachings of "Eddian Science," this really doesn't seem to amount to much. That would have told her that God's omnipotence was in no way needed, and that there really was no such thing as "sciatic rheumatism" at all. Indeed in almost all the cases the patients seem to have got hardly any hold of this glorious "Science," but to have had simply a faith in ordinary Christian teaching, and to have fancied that Christians did not hold or teach it.

Case 14.—"Grateful for Many Blessings." In this case, again, the doctors seem to recede into the background, though not disappearing altogether. She (or he perhaps) ascribes a painful back to some (of course needless) operation, and at the end the patient "had doctored with three of the best physicians in Seattle, but none could give me relief." The present writer hates to say anything against the climate of Seattle, for he really thinks it is very nice, but it was there that he had the worst case in his life of what might be called "catarrh of the throat," which this patient seems to have had there. It may have happened that some other climate was better for that trouble. But no; we are assured that it was "Christian Science," we don't know just where. It began, though, with the "painful back."

Case 15.—This, for a change, is that of a "minister's son." His trouble was being a neurasthenic. He was "constantly taking medicine for eight years," and "had eleven physicians attending him," when he

called in Dr. Eddy and her Christian Science, and presumably dropped the others, and also the "very many patent medicines" which he had been taking, on which in the month or so previous he had spent no less than eighteen dollars. This was certainly going the patent medicine business *some*. It was probably on the sly, for the eleven physicians would, we should think, have objected.

This seems to be a pretty clear case of "too many cooks spoiling the broth." The cooks being discharged, and *Science and Health* being substituted, before he had half finished the book he "was eating everything that anyone does." He read the book, curiously enough, "eleven times straight ahead" (once to counteract the effects of each physician), "and many times skipping about." Not, you understand, skipping about on his feet, but on the book. In this case a good big dose of the book seems to have been needed; and no wonder.

Case 16.—"Many Ills Overcome." In this case the lady tells us that she "has received much help, spiritually and physically, through Christian Science." One of the troubles was that she could not sleep; but "trouble of every kind disappeared before I had read *Science and Health* through." We are beginning to understand now why it seems to take so long, usually, to finish the book; it must be that one goes to sleep. And really that is quite natural. There are so many things in it that are repeated over and over. Really, when we have the condensation of it at the end of our "Recapitulation," there is not much of anything else. This is confirmed by the statement that her husband "was healed of the tobacco habit of fifty years standing by reading *Science and Health*." One couldn't

smoke and read *Science and Health* at the same time, you see.

Case 17.—"A Helpful Healing." In this case, another lady tells us that "I was healed of neuralgia of the stomach, from which I had suffered from a child. As I grew older, the spells became more frequent and more severe; the only relief physicians could give me was by hypodermic injections of morphine. Finally after each spell, I would be prostrated for a day or two with the after effect of the morphine. I was entirely healed of this trouble through the study of *Science and Health.*"

In spite of all this, however, she seems to have been much alarmed at the idea of trying it on her children. She says: "I think I never realized what fear meant till I began to try and put into practice my understanding of Christian Science for my children." It really seems strange this talk one meets with so often about "understanding of Christian Science." It seems quite easy to understand it; it simply consists in being quite sure that there is nothing whatever the matter with anyone who seems to be sick. But putting it into practice does often seem, and actually is, rather difficult.

The first time she realized this was in something which seemed to her to be "a severe case of croup for my little boy." But she made up her mind that it had got to be "science" for him, kill or cure; and didn't know quite how to go to work. So she just picked up the book and began to read aloud. While doing so, a text occurred to her (Heb. iv. 12), which doesn't seem to have any connection with Christian Science. That seemed to help the child at once; and it is to be hoped that she also prayed, as any

ordinary good Christian would. Well, it does seem that the cure of the croup—if croup it was—might be ascribed to the real word of God and prayer; but we can't see what Christian Science had to do with it, or why it is put on this list.

Case 18.—"Relief from Many Ills." Here again, we find that in the case of the school teacher who contributes it, deafness, etc., "has been overcome by an enlarged understanding of God's word, as explained by Mrs. Eddy in *Science and Health.*" But we don't understand what is meant by this "enlarged" understanding. It would seem to be rather contracted than enlarged, as the Scripture in Mrs. Eddy's book is very limited in amount, and is only commented on at any length in her "Key" to parts of two of its books, and there chiefly to perverting their plain sense, or explaining it away.

Case 19.—"Health and Peace Attained." This really doesn't seem to be much of a case. The patient had been treated by eminent physicians for "hereditary consumption" (we didn't know there was a special "hereditary" kind), "torpid liver, and many other diseases." From an orthodox Protestant he finally became "a follower of Voltaire, Tom Paine and Ingersoll." But it doesn't make much difference what he was in that way. He read Mrs. Eddy's book from Tuesday to Friday, and then (what was of more importance) *prayed,* and arrived at the orthodox conclusion "that there is one Fatherhood of God, and one brotherhood of man," which he must have believed before, if he had been any kind of an "orthodox Protestant." But he did not get as far as the "motherhood," or any distinctively Eddian doctrine. His health, however, improved. But we don't see

what right Mrs. Eddy has to this case, or in fact why she put it in. We are not told even that he became a "Scientist."

Case 20.—"Health and Peace Gained." This gentleman had been "drawn to Christian Science by a relative whose many afflictions had given place to health and harmony." After a while (time not exactly stated) he got rid of asthma (another "hereditary" case) and neuralgia in an aggravated form, and gave up tobacco and liquor. Not a word, in this case, about doctors, or medical treatment of any kind. Not much of a case, it must, we think, be admitted.

Case 21.—"Consumption Quickly Cured." This case is a better one than those which we have been having lately. It is given to us by a gentleman who narrates the healing of his wife of "what the doctors called consumption in its last stages." What precisely the doctors called "consumption" is not stated, and of course the names of the doctors are not given. But so far as they recommended anything it seems to have been a "higher, drier climate, and when she would be at her worst to give her something to quiet her." And at last she became so much worse that he called in a doctor again. He says that this doctor also diagnosed the case, but it does not say that he also called it "consumption." But at any rate, he agreed with the advice of the others in ordering "some morphine tablets to make her rest." Two had been given, apparently, without any good effect, and "just before the time to give her another" she called me to her bedside and said, "Don't give me any more of that stuff, for it does me more harm than good;" so the husband obediently put them at once into the fire.

Next day a Christian Science lady called and

loaned to the patient a copy of *Science and Health.* The patient read it from ten o'clock till dinner was called. She then ate a hearty dinner, the first in about three days; having, as it would seem, made up her mind that there was nothing the matter with her, after all; and then read the book "two hours a day for eight days, and was healed." Three months afterward it was found that she had gained forty pounds in weight.

Now if this patient really had pulmonary consumption this case was certainly one answering to the title, "Consumption Quickly Cured." But there is just where the doubt comes in. The lady seems to have eaten a "hearty dinner" three days before she got the book; and that is not usual with patients "in the last stages of consumption."

So the evidence does not seem quite as conclusive as one might be inclined to think. It looks more like a nervous or imaginary trouble. We do not read even that the doctors prescribed any medicinal treatment except "something to quiet her." The husband, it is true, "had tried everything that he could get in the way of *materia medica;*" but he does not say that the doctors had prescribed this treatment. It would be likely, it would seem, to aggravate the case, and to be evidence of rather a strong constitution in the patient. So we are obliged to drop this promising case for want of sufficient evidence.

Case 22.—"A Profitable Study." This seems, in one way, even stronger than the last. The physicians ventured on the statement "that one lung was gone, and that the other was afflicted with tuberculosis;" and the patient "tried every remedy that they had suggested." At last she tried "Christian

Science." This of course, if the lady thoroughly absorbed its teachings, showed to her clearly that the doctors had been mistaken, and the idea that she ever had any lungs was merely "an error of mortal mind." So of course she realized that she could not have even one lung left, whether "afflicted with tuberculosis" or not.

But the worst is yet to come. After getting over her trouble, she says, "I feel absolutely certain that I have two sound, healthy lungs now." That is to say, "I feel absolutely certain that Christian Science is all humbug. For of course we learn from this science that matter does not exist. To take just one passage of *Science and Health* at random, we find that "the objects cognized by the physical senses have not the reality of substance. They are only what mortal belief calls them. Matter, sin and mortality lose all supposed consciousness or claim to life or existence, as mortals lay off a false sense of life, substance and intelligence." This was really too bad to give Christian Science such a blow in the face, when it had done her so much good.

Case 23.—"Healed of Infidelity and Many Physical Ills." In this case as to the infidelity part, it seems to have been cured, not by *Science and Health*, but by the New Testament. As for "the disease with which I had been troubled for years," we learned that it tormented me worse than ever for about six months, as if trying to turn me aside, but I lost all fear of it. We don't quite see how he "can honestly say that *Science and Health* was my only healer, and it has been my only teacher," when there is so little of the New Testament in it, and so much in the New Testament which is dead against it.

Case 24.—"Diseased Eyes Cured," has already been discussed before going through this regular enumeration.

Case 25.—"The Textbook Healed Me." No details are given in this, so we may omit it. It only says that "I had been under the care of a physician much of the time," that "different opinions were given by them," and that I was healed through reading *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* by Mrs. Eddy.

Case 26.—"Obstinate Stomach Trouble Healed." There is hardly anything about the "case" in this. It only says: "I had suffered for years from an obstinate form of stomach trouble, and that after three or four months study I realized that the stomach trouble was gone."

Case 27.—"Dyspepsia Quickly Healed." This again doesn't seem to be a very strange one. The cure seems to have been chiefly accomplished by "ignoring entirely the most rigid kind of diet." The present writer had a case in his own person, in which the cure resulted, apparently, by ignoring rigid rules of diet, taking more active and varied physical and mental exercise, and learning to smoke.

Case 28.—"After Twenty Years Suffering." In this case the doctor, it is true, diagnosed it as "spinal trouble, originating from a bad fall." But no doctor seems to have been called in at the time of the fall. It may have been spinal trouble, but it reminds one somewhat of an obstinate case of "hysteria" which we met with in the course of our experience, in which the girl could not be persuaded to get out of bed. But in this case Christian Science produced the desired effect. The doctor, in the case just mentioned, thought an alarm of fire might be a good thing.

One curious thing in this account is especially worthy of notice. The writer, in conclusion, says: "I have grown to thank God with deepest sincerity that one brave woman was found pure enough to bring forth this Christ-healing again, to remain forever among men, and save suffering humanity from all disease and sin." Of course this was written before the death of Mrs. Eddy. But the confidence that the writer seems to have had that Mrs. Eddy was "to remain forever" seems to indicate that she was not deficient in the faith which, after all, is required for this special kind of "science."

Case 29.—"From Despair to Hope and Joy." This one, in the patient's own mind, was certainly an extraordinary one. "From childhood," she says, "I was always sick, never knew one hour of rest, and was under the doctor's care most of the time." She never, it would seem, slept, even when in bed. She tells us: "I grew steadily worse, until at last I was obliged to keep my bed for nearly three years—a great sufferer. My ailments were, it seemed, all that flesh is heir to, and were called incurable by the doctors, viz., Bright's disease, and many others" all, of course, "in the last stages. My case was known among physicians, many of whom were prominent specialists, as a most extreme one." However, relief was at hand. "The little book was handed me at this hour of great need. I read it, and read it again, and soon found myself growing stronger, then I kept on reading, and was perfectly healed of all my supposedly incurable diseases."

Of course, as in all the other cases, we do not learn the name of a single one of these physicians and specialists. Probably they could not make out what was really the

matter with her; anyway, the idea which she had, that there was something the matter with her, was pronounced as incurable by the doctors. But she learned from the "little book" that there really was *nothing* the matter with her; and we should think might have learned that at the very first reading. At last she believed what the little book said, and of course got well right away.

Case 30.—"Truth Makes Free." In this case the subject of the cure was the "son of a physician, a graduate in pharmacy, and an ex-druggist;" not three different people, but all three combined in one. In spite of these safeguards, however, he had suffered from catarrh and sore throat for thirty years; "and in the last five" (of the thirty) "were added several others, including dyspepsia and bronchitis, and a loss in flesh of sixty pounds." All these troubles were cured "through the spiritual understanding of Christian Science, the result of about six weeks study."

"When I learned," he says, "that Jesus' mission of healing sickness as well as sin did not end with His short stay upon earth, but is practical in all ages, my joy was unbounded." One hardly sees why it took him so long to learn this, as all Christians have always believed it; only they have usually believed that such healing is mainly accomplished by prayer, rather than by reading a book, and studying on it; and have not been sure that it would be attained every time, but that, on the contrary, bodily ills would not be cured when the cure would be unfavorable to spiritual interests; or, in other words, that Christian healing is not a "science," but a special and supernatural gift from God. Indeed he tells us that his study was "prayerful," and that may have helped in the cure,

which does not seem to have been a phenomenal one.

Case 31.—"Deaf Ears Unstopped." This lady states that she "was healed of hereditary deafness and catarrh of the head, simply through reading the book, *Science and Health*." We do not know exactly what "hereditary" deafness is, or how it differs from the ordinary kind; or what is the difference between catarrh of the head and a persistent "cold in the head." But she had not read fifty pages before she was all right, and "never had a return of the ailment." Those first fifty pages are mostly about what the book calls "Prayer," which certainly ought to help; but the book says, as it would seem, that prayer chiefly consists in "denying sin and pleading God's allness." This is somewhat mysterious, but would seem to mean that there is no sin, and nothing whatever except God, as this is the regular Eddian doctrine. But perhaps, even at this early stage, one might grasp the idea that deafness and catarrh of the head were only wild delusions, and "deny" them both. Most people cannot get on so far as soon as that; and even if they did, the delusions would probably go on, all the same. But a real, thorough Scientist pays no attention to the testimony of the material senses, as we know; he only regards what ought to be, not what actually is. So even his testimony as to "cures" is not so very convincing. If one ought to be well, one is. So, after all, these testimonies as to "cures" may be really only to the effect that at the time at which the testifiers say they were cured, they had made up their minds that they ought to have been, or must have been.

She gives another case, appended to this, of a little girl of three who had met with some accident, and

this same lady, her mother, thought the child had dislocated her shoulder. The little girl cried, of course, a great deal. After a while the pain subsided; and about four hours later "she was playing out doors as though nothing had ever happened." There is not a scrap of evidence from any physician or surgeon that there had been any dislocation at all.

Case 32.—"Saved from Insanity and Suicide." The lady who narrates this had a daughter who had been "given up by *materia medica* to die of lingering consumption." Probably she means given up by the doctors. "My own condition seemed even more alarming," she says, "as insanity was being manifested, and rather than go to an insane asylum it seemed to me the only thing to do was to commit suicide." She does not seem to have been very firmly grounded in Christianity. However, her doctor tried to persuade her to undergo an operation as a means of relief; not for insanity, but for various other diseases.

But she concluded to try insanity in a milder form, that of *Science and Health;* like getting vaccinated to avoid the smallpox. So she started in with the chapter on "Prayer." She says: "I did not at that time suppose it possible for me to remember anything I read, but I felt a sweet sense of God's protection and power, and a hope that I should at last find Him to be what I so much needed—a present help in time of trouble." There seems to be no reason why she could not have found this to be stated as the case in any ordinary Christian book. But, strange to say, "before that chapter on 'Prayer' was finished" (which would take, we should think, at most sixteen minutes, as there are only sixteen pages of it), though she seems to have got no good from it herself other than as above stated,

her "daughter was down stairs eating three meals a day, and daily growing stronger. Before I had finished reading the textbook she was well, but never having heard that the reading of *Science and Health* healed anyone, it was several months before I gave God the glory." All her own ailments, she tells us, "left me, all but the headaches; they were less frequent, until at the end of three years the fear of them was entirely overcome."

She concludes with something even more remarkable. It is the case of "an unhappy woman who was about to separate from her husband." She was asked if she did not love her husband. She replied, "No; when I married him I did, but not now." One would expect that she would have been told to be faithful to him, and get along as well as she could. But what was she told? She was told that "God made man in His image and likeness, and that He" (God) "is perfect;" and that she should "go home and see only God's perfect man; you don't need to love a sinful mortal such as you have been looking upon."

Most people would think that the old-fashioned advice given by Our Lord, "Love your enemies: do good to them that hate you," would have been more Christian than this; especially as there seems to have been nothing specially objectionable in the poor husband. And St. Paul insists strongly that husbands should love their wives; and what is sauce for the gander would be specially in order for such a goose, as this one seems to have been. But no; instead of regular Christianity, we must have such "scientific" twaddle as this "case" gives us. We have quoted it rather at length, as it is such an exceptional combination of superstition and pseudo-spirituality.

Case 33.—"Stomach Trouble Healed." This is the case of a traveling salesman, who says: "It was a common occurrence for me to have to call a physician to my hotel to administer morphine for an acute form of this disease."

It is a curious thing that however inefficacious drugs may seem to be, morphine seems always to work, as in Cases 17 and 21. In this one we learn: "I had tried many physicians and most of the usual remedies during these years of suffering, without any good result." These "usual remedies" evidently do not include morphine. What the stomach trouble was we do not learn; but as far as we are informed, it seems to have been simply a stomachache. It must have been rather severe to call for morphine. No particulars are given of the healing, except, that "as a last resort, I decided to try Christian Science, and I was healed" (that is to say, did not have any more stomachaches) "by reading *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures,*" by Mrs. Eddy.

Case 34.—"Freed from Many Years of Suffering." This is another case of stomachache. Also bladderache and corns. Rheumatism and grip every winter. Also a growth on both eyes, which "caused my eyes to be inflamed nearly all the time." It was called "cataract," but whether so called by the doctors we are not informed. Of course there is no medical certificate. In spite of the inflamed eyes, this patient was able to read *Science and Health,* and "was healed in a short time by reading this work."

Case 35.—"Relief from Intense Suffering." In this case no one seems to have been sure what was the matter; "one physician diagnosed the case as a dangerous kidney disease, and said that no medicine could

help me, but that I must undergo a surgical operation." Another doctor "made an examination and diagnosed the difficulty as something different, but quite as serious." At last she promised to read *Science and Health,* and "on Sunday morning I sat down to read it. When I reached the place where Mrs. Eddy says she found this truth in the Bible, I began comparing the two books." We are not told what particular truth she is referring to. It is evident that most of the teachings of Mrs. Eddy could not be found anywhere in the Bible. "I read passages" (she says, but does not say in which book) "which looked very reasonable to me, and I said to myself this is nearer to the truth than anything I have ever seen." Neither the Bible nor Mrs. Eddy, it would seem, were exactly right, but somewhere near. But at last she "felt" that she was healed, but "read on and was certainly healed;" and tells us that "eight days after the healing I did my own washing." Six weeks later she had another examination by her former physician, and he said the trouble was certainly gone, and that God had healed her. She seems to think this a clear testimony to the efficacy of *Science and Health,* as if no one had imagined that God had healed, or did at any rate heal any one nowadays, till that book was published.

Case 36.—"Gratitude for Many Blessings." This patient first heard of Christian Science about fifteen years ago, and then was told of the book by a friend. The patient said to the friend: "If that is a key to the Scriptures, I must have it." It would seem that it must have been rather a shock to find that the book was not such a "Key" at all, but only some rather surprising explanations of five or six chapters out of the whole Scriptures. However,

in spite of this obvious deficiency, it "illumined the Bible with a glorious light, and I began to understand some of the Master's sayings," that is, it would seem, to understand that some of the plainest statements made by Him were very far from being true.

This patient did not have any serious disease, so far as is stated, but thought that there were many physical troubles, not, however, as would appear, enough to bother a doctor about. But it became evident by simply reading *Science and Health* that "I had no disease—I was perfectly free." This glorious truth was only imperfectly apprehended by the patients in the cases thus far; they clung to the belief that they had been sick, at any rate.

Case 37.—"Gratitude for Moral and Spiritual Awakening." The awakening in this case seems to have been chiefly the discovery that a habit of almost incessant smoking could be and actually was broken up by Mrs. Eddy's book, and that the desire for drink also yielded to it. "I wish to say here, that I received all these benefits before I had gained much understanding of what I was reading." From the way in which the patients in these cases often speak of the book, one would think it was a very profound and abstruse one. We don't remember that any great point is made in it about smoking or drinking. The general directions given in it are rather of the go-as-you-please character. It proved to be, it seems, quite a help to him in his business. This is, perhaps, not very wonderful. Mrs. Eddy had certainly a good head for business, and knew very well how to make money. But to acquire skill in this hardly seems to be exactly "a moral and spiritual awakening."

Case 38.—"Hereditary Disease of the Lungs Cured."

In this case the patient says that consumption was hereditary in our family; but it is not stated that she had it herself. She had, however, severe stomach trouble of over eight years standing, and wore glasses for fourteen years. She does not state definitely that she was cured of any of these things; the "spiritual unfolding and uplifting" was "the pearl of great price." It does seem rather ungrateful to grumble in this way about the great price which one has to pay for "our textbook."

Case 39.—"Textbook Appreciated." This is even a more vague case than the last. It is really only a sort of advertisement of the book. Strange to say it tells us that "the honest study of this book, in connection with the Bible, will enable one to 'prove all things.'" The impression we have got from it is rather that you have got to take Mrs. Eddy's word for all things, and not try to prove them at all.

Case 40.—"Rupture and other Serious Ills Healed." This old lady says: "I was so absorbed in the study of this 'little book,' that I was healed, not only of the rupture, but also of other troubles—inflammatory rheumatism, catarrh, corns and bunions." This case seems rather comical. Wonder if the old lady had all these troubles at the same time.

Case 41.—"Mother and Daughter Healed." The trouble with the mother was constipation, for which she had been "taking medicines every day for twenty years." Cured by reading the textbook for three days! It is not told us what was the matter with her little daughter, but she was healed of something, anyway.

Case 42.—"Liver Complaint Healed." The only symptom which we can find in this case was a number of "odd looking spots," a few of which first appeared

on one arm, but afterward they spread round quite generally. Various physicians were called for a cure, but finally the patient was pronounced so full of medicine that the last one was afraid to have her take any more. The first one had said that the spots were "liver spots." We have never heard of these. The opinions of the other doctors are not given. The patient seems at last to have given up worrying about them, and started to read *Science and Health.* When she had read about half of the book, and it occurred to her to look for the spots, she could not find them. The medicines, perhaps, had worked them out of her system. This is not claimed as a very strong case; but now we come to

Case 43.—"A Convincing Investigation." In this case, however, though the father of the patient was a physician, and her mother had the same disease (whatever it was) herself, the father does not seem to have been able to give it a name. But he had sensible views about giving too much medicine, and thought it was better to have some pain than to keep dosing all the time. At last some one told her about Christian Science. "I replied," she tells us, "that I believed God could heal, but that I had no faith in the healing of Christian Science, but would like to investigate its theology, as it might aid in giving one some clue to the meaning of life. For three years I had searched the works of the most scientific writers to find the origin of life; many times I would think I had traced it to the beginning, but it would elude my grasp every time."

If instead of "searching the words of the most scientific writers" she had taken one short look into a ten-cent catechism, she would have found all that

she was looking for, right away. But instead of doing so, she got hold of *Science and Health,* and found a paragraph near the middle which attracted her attention. She has never been able to find it again, or apparently to remember it. The advantage of the catechism would have been that even a small child can find there all that is needed, and as often as desired; so it would seem preferable, though we would not guarantee that it would cure her of all pain. We might guess that what this lady did find was something to the effect that she herself was just a part of "Mind," and that as that could have no pain, this idea of pain was quite out of the question. So she made up her mind that it must be stamped right out.

At one leap, she got far beyond Mrs. Eddy herself. We have heard that Mrs. Eddy was at one time suffering from a toothache. Feeling that her science might be wrecked if she should go to a dentist in her own town about it, she went to another, quite a long distance away, and told him she would like to have him examine into it. As her portraits had been often published (we have one in our own copy), the dentist came forward quite pleased, and said, "Please sit down a moment, Mrs. Eddy, and let me have a look at that tooth." We think, but are not sure, that she must have, at any rate outwardly, just denied any pain (like the lady who "broke" her arm when she fell off the bicycle in our first case), and then escaped as soon as possible to try her luck somewhere else. We have also heard, but probably incorrectly, that "Scientists," in memory of this notable event, make toothache an exception to their rules, and allow treatment for it. If this Hegiran change of base

is an actual historical fact, it furnishes a point of resemblance between Mrs. Eddy and her illustrious predecessor Mohammed, additional to those already commented on.

Case 44.—"Deafness and Dropsy Healed." This patient tells us that she "had been deaf from childhood." The precise extent of this deafness is not stated. Dropsy was another of her complaints. This, combined with consumption, quite naturally caused one doctor to say, "It puzzles me; I have never seen such a case before as yours." But of course it could not stand up against *Science and Health.* She got a copy of this, and "in three weeks was entirely cured." On Eddian principles we also know, of course, that she never had dropsy or consumption; and from the statement of the doctor the same would appear probable. But any way she "felt uplifted," which was the main thing.

Case 45.—"Grateful for Many Blessings." This patient had for a number of years been "a semi-invalid, with no help of ever being well and strong again." Indeed it did seem that there was not much chance of it, for "at the time I began the study of Christian Science I was taking five kinds of medicine." This was not quite so bad as the case (No. 15) of the minister's son, with "almost all known drugs," and "very many patent medicines," but still it would be likely to sicken most people. On starting in with *Science and Health* these medicines were probably laid on the shelf, and "gradually my bodily diseases left me." "In my girlhood," she says, "I had always prayed to the God I held in mind, and when the shadow of sickness, pain and death came into my family, I prayed as only those can who know that when

He helps not, there is none." It was after this, of course, that she began on the five kinds of medicine.

The case concludes with an account of an experience with her daughter who came home one morning from her school, saying: "Mother, I have measles, twenty of the girls are sick in bed, and I am afraid they will put me there also." This time they did not pray or give medicine, and of course did not call in a doctor, but "began immediately to do our work in Science;" just what this scientific work was is not explained. When it was completed, at any rate, it was evident that the notion of the girl having measles was simply an "error of mortal mind." "Her face was clear, her eyes bright, and all fear was destroyed. That was the end of the disease."

Case 46.—"A Joyful Experience." In this case the patient had ailments of many years standing. "Chronic stomach trouble, severe eye trouble" (perhaps she was even told that she might have to wear spectacles), and a painful rupture of twenty-five years standing, (for which, however a truss is not said to have been needed). The same may be said of other cases of "rupture" which are recorded in the list.

She "had entirely lost her belief in an all-merciful God, and did not know where to turn for help." But at last Christian Science was brought to her notice. "I shall never forget," she says, "the sublime moment when I perceived that a loving Father is always with me." All Christians, so far as we are aware, perceive this all the time; but they also know that the Scripture tells us (Heb. xii. 6) that "whom the Lord loveth, He chastiseth, and He scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." (The same is told us in Prov.

iii. 11, 12.) Of course this is not in Mrs. Eddy's "Key." So the Lord may, on account of their ignorance, let up on those who have never heard of it, and take to "Science" instead of the Bible; and as ailments do them no good, grant that such ailments may "disappear" (as in this case); and give them the goods of this world, instead of another in which they do not care to believe. We would recommend to such the whole passage, Heb. xii. 5-11.

Case 47.—"An Ever Present Help." This patient tells us that about a year previous to writing this testimonial, he began to read *Science and Health.* "My condition," he says, "was then very trying." He had then actually worn glasses for four years. He also had catarrh; which we must say was not very astonishing, for he was "an excessive smoker, using tobacco in some form almost constantly."

But it was somewhat remarkable, that after reading the book only three weeks, he "was completely healed of the tobacco habit." For the book, so far as we remember, if it speaks of the tobacco habit at all, certainly does not say much about it. The general idea of the book is that one ought not to bother oneself about such things, but to be serenely confident that nothing can do one any harm, if one keeps firm in the conviction that all is "Mind." Indeed it rather discourages ascetic or self-denying practices of any kind. But still, if one can succeed in really believing that one has no body, and that there is no such thing as tobacco, it would naturally follow that there was no use in spending good money by pretending to buy it. For money is an exception to the general Eddian rule that matter has no real existence.

So, on giving up smoking, which, as he tells us,

"did not require even so much as a resolution (so firmly he was persuaded that there is really no such thing as smoking), his eyes got better (the smoke no longer getting into them), and his heart became normal, and the catarrh disappeared. This testimonial, then, seems really to be simply to the effect that when one is an excessive smoker, it is good to give up smoking, if one can only manage it. And that if Mrs. Eddy's theories can be thoroughly adopted, they will be a great help to this desirable end.

Case 48.—"Severe Eye Trouble Overcome." This is another case of "glasses." This lady had worn them for sixteen years; why she had done so is not explained. Perhaps she did not need them at all. Of course specialists, as usual, were consulted. "None of them held out any hope that my sight would ever be restored," so that she could see all right with glasses. At last after reading *Science and Health,* she became convinced that the idea of wearing glasses was an "error of mortal mind," and she laid them aside. "Through an understanding of Truth," she says, "I have found my sight as perfect as God gave it." We don't quite understand how she found out how "perfect" that was, as "the defect had existed since infancy." This "case," certainly, does not seem to be clearly explained. They may, of course, be something in it, but a statement from the "specialists" themselves would be, more even than usually, desirable. One thing in the statement, as she gives it, comes out plainly; that is, that in her judgment, Mrs. Eddy is right, and the Epistle to the Hebrews and book of Proverbs (quoted above in Case 46) wrong.

Case 49.—"A Testimony from Ireland." This invalid, it seems, had erroneously imagined that the

Bible, in the passages just mentioned and others, was the Word of God; but discovered that this was not the case, but overcame this delusion on learning that "there is but one God, and that Mrs. Eddy is His prophet." In this sentence, in quotation marks, we have ventured to substitute "Mrs. Eddy" for "Mahomet."

Case 50.—"The Textbook Makes Operation Unnecessary." This case seems to be simply, when impartially viewed, that the physician who advised an operation was mistaken as to its necessity; and that beside the trouble for which he advised it, misled perhaps by her account of the "symptoms," she got rid of "severe headaches," and a mysterious "stomach trouble," which may have been due to too much "drugging."

Case 51.—"Kidney Diseases and Eye Trouble Healed." Beside the disease mentioned in the title above, the nature of which is not stated, we are also told that "my general health was very bad." But "we bought the textbook, and what a revelation it was and is to us; it is indeed the fountain of Truth." When one has that, the Bible is of no use, unless indeed the small portion of it which Mrs. Eddy condescends to comment on to suit her theories. It may be laid aside, like the glasses, which seem to come to the front in these recent cases. Well, we must acknowledge that the print in the "textbook" is remarkably good.

Case 52—"Disease of Bowels Healed." This case, we are told, "four physicians failed even to diagnose." The last one "advised me to take no more medicine for these attacks." It is possible that they may have come from imprudence in eating; we know of such

cases, and drugs were not, and could not be, of any use, but rather would make things worse.

Case 53.—"Healed by Reading the Textbook." In this the usual specialists said that "the patient was in the last stages of kidney disease." What kind of kidney disease we are not informed. "Glasses," of course, had also been worn; though we did not know that they were recommended for any kind of kidney disease. However, we are told that "I have never had any glasses on since I first began reading *Science and Health*, and I have not used any medicine." So much gained, at any rate.

Case 54.—"A Testimony from Scotland." In this curious case the patient was under the impression that he had "very bad rheumatism." The doctors, it would seem, also were under the same. "I suffered," he tells us, "day and night, and nothing relieved me until Science proved to me the falseness of this belief by removing it." It is, however, remarkable that one erroneous belief about it still seems to remain, that medicine had been of some use; for we learn that "I had often tried to be without it" (a particular medicine that he had taken every day for ten years), "but was always ill and had to return to it."

"Now," however, we are told, "I am quite free from all these material laws." Still, we have an idea that some day he will find, if he has not already found, that the material law of death remains in force. This case, we have assumed, is a male one. But one can't always tell, for only initials are given in any of the cases.

Case 55.—"Curing Better Than Enduring." This one is more of a case than most of the others that we have lately been looking at. We are told that ten

different physicians had pronounced it "tuberculosis," but of course there is no certificate to that effect. Beside this, there was an absolute constipation. *Science and Health,* the patient assures us, was the absolute cure of both of these serious complaints. She "acquired a better understanding" of the book; though what there is in it hard to understand, is really a mystery. But she "endeavored to put into practice" what she had learned. This is another mystery; it seems to mean not to put into practice the drugging previously resorted to. Doing nothing at all does not seem to require much "endeavor." At any rate, after three months, the bowels were in better order than ever before; but she "had always suffered more or less from bowel trouble." "Now," we don't know how long it took, "they are normally active." "My lungs," she says, "are now sound." We must confess that we should like to have scientific medical certificates as to the state of her lungs before the cure and afterwards. Nothing is said, for instance, about the "sputa," and, indeed, the patient herself only says that she had "weak lungs." But we all know that the progress of even real tuberculosis is sometimes arrested, and that what remains of the lungs becomes sound.

Case 56.—"Severe Eczema Destroyed." This is also a good case. Eczema is, no doubt, an obstinate malady; though we personally know of cases in which it has been cured by prayer, in a few days, though medical treatment had been fruitless. The strange thing about this one is that the Bible alone did no good in twenty-eight years; but *Science and Health with* the Bible obtained the result "in less than a week."

Case 57.—"*Science and Health* a Priceless Boon."

Here we get back a little into the more ordinary lines. The word "priceless" seems not to be rigorously accurate, but we will not be too critical about a little thing like that. This patient had, just when we are not told, "paralysis of the bowels, frequent sick headaches with unutterable agony, and my mortal career was nearly brought to an end by a malignant type of yellow fever." This one seems not to have been an "error," and the doctors, who probably were called in, might have been given some credit for curing it. But the old "glasses" come in for a word of censure. The use of them "was proven needless" and they were laid aside.

"Mrs. Eddy," we are told, "has made Scripture reading a well of comfort to me. By her interpretation, the 'way of the Lord is made straight to me and mine.'" It certainly does make the way of the Lord more intelligible, if one can cut out nearly all of it, and have the small remnant interpreted in a sense that you fancy, which is very different from the one that it naturally conveys.

Case 58.—"A Critic Convinced." This case can hardly be called one of disease at all, though we are told that "by the study of the book, and the resultant understanding of my relation to God, I was healed of a disease with which I had been afflicted from childhood." The "relation to God" referred to must have been that the patient was not created by God, but was God or "Mind" (herself or himself); for that is what the book teaches. The disease is not specified, but perhaps it was simply that of getting old; and of course it became plain that this was impossible for God.

Case 59.—"Born Again." This lady tells us that

she was "reared from childhood in an intellectual atmosphere, my paternal grandfather having been an orthodox minister of the old school for forty years, and my father a deep student, ever seeking for the truth of all things." Perhaps he was one of those of whom St. Paul writes to Timothy, who are "ever learning, and never attaining to the knowledge of the truth" (2 Tim. iii. 7). At any rate she also "began early to ponder and to study into the meaning of life," which any little catechism could have taught her, and came to the conclusion that "though God probably existed in some remote place, still it was impossible to connect Him with my present living." This was quite an original result of the pondering, hitherto not reached by any Christian; or, so far as we are aware, by anyone whatever. But some "dear friend" left *Science and Health* on the piano one day, containing the well-known and universally accepted doctrine of the spirituality and omnipresence of God. She "saw that she must get the right understanding of God!"

Probably everyone of her acquaintance believed this about God, but Mrs. Eddy had stated, that for the establishing of health (the only important thing in life, of course) one must not only believe this, but needs to "understand" it. So she, "with head bowed in prayer, waited with longing intensity for some answer" to make her understand it. "How long I waited, I do not know," she says, "but suddenly, like a wonderful burst of sunlight after a storm, came clearly this thought, 'Be still and know that I am God' (Ps. xlvi. 10. King James Version). I held my breath—deep into my hungering thought sank the infinite meaning of that I." Isn't this simply sickening, to have all this sentimentality about a truth which we

all joyfully receive, and to imagine that it was a mysterious "understanding" which Mrs. Eddy's book brought to her!

Case 60.—"A Restless Sense of Existence Destroyed." This patient had lots of diseases. "Ulceration of the stomach with kindred troubles" was one; "restless sense of existence" (a new disease) another; "agnosticism" a third. The doctors did not try to treat the last two, but of course (as usual in Christian Science cases) the attending physician declared that on account of the first, "I could not live but a short time." "But the disease was dissipated into nothingness" (its original condition, probably) "through Christian Science" No doctor's certificate, of course.

Case 61.—"Morally and Physically Healed." This, again, is a case of glasses; which, however, the patient, declined to wear, and ascribes his getting along, up to date, without them, to Christian Science. He was also "healed of another ailment which had been with me all my life, and which was believed to be inherited." We have no idea what it was. Also "profanity, the use of tobacco, a very quick temper," etc. Unusually shallow water we are getting into now as we get near the shore, or end of the cases.

Case 62.—"Health and Understanding Gained." In this case there seems to have been nothing whatever even alleged as being the matter; it was only that the gentleman was afraid that perhaps some time there might be. He thought, however, which must have been quite cheering, that he "knew a material remedy for every ill." He bought, however, for an extra safeguard, a copy of *Science and Health;* and, strangely as it seems to us, "saw that if the Bible

was true, *Science and Health* must also be true." To ourselves it seems rather the other way; for Mrs. Eddy's chief aim, in her "Key to the Scriptures," at any rate, is evidently to show that the small portion of them to which it is applied is false; as we have already seen.

Case 63.—"An Ever Present Help Found." Here we find near the start the strange statement, often noticeable, that "in Mrs. Eddy's book I came across a great deal of thought that was not readily understood at the first reading." We suppose that he means "swallowed," rather than "understood." Understanding it seems to be easy enough. But to accustom us to swallow everything, however difficult, he gives us one of the hardest yearns that we have yet come across. He spins it out to some length, but a short abridgment may suffice, so perhaps it may be well to give it, as follows.

In the course of his carpenter work, he was accidently hit by a bit of wood, and found by his hand that there "were two wounds, one on the lock of the jaw, and another forward, as big as a dollar, on the cheek bone." Being a "Scientist," he knew that no real harm could happen in the "realm of Divine Love" (that is the correct phrase, we believe), so he "treated" the imaginary injury in the usual "scientific" way, and "paid no more attention to the matter," but, as he narrates it, "went to bed, and slept all night until near daylight, when a pain on the right side awoke me." This, as we understand, was the side which had *not* been struck by the bit of wood. It would seem, then, that the bit of wood must have gone right through the left cheek and also wounded the right one. But he has stated that "bouncing off

my left cheek," it "fell about twenty feet off on the snow." It must, then, have *bounced off the snow* (snow is not usually so elastic) on to his right cheek. This was certainly carrying out very literally Our Lord's command "to him that striketh thee on the one cheek, offer also the other." So he found that he had to "treat" the right cheek also, after which, as he tells us, he "went to sleep again." Well, this is probably all right. But now comes the astonishing part. He tells us: "I never lost an hour from the hurt, though I found out that *my jaw was broken!*"

Now, my dear sir, it seems to us that you are going a little too far; rather, in fact, beyond the limit. We have swallowed without a murmur the story of the bit of wood ("just a small wooden wedge" as he told us) hitting both cheeks, the left one in two places, as we have also been distinctly informed; but when we are told that after the breaking of the jaw, which injury no doctor seems to have even looked at, all that remained to show for the accident was "a little red spot on the cheek" (which of the two we don't know), "and the lumps on the bone, which have long since disappeared," we are obliged to say: "Tell that to the marines (or other scientists); but don't expect an ordinary matter of fact person to believe it."

Probably he had no such expectation; for this case, like all the others, was published for the special edification of "Scientists," not for the vulgar herd. But as it was liable to be read by anyone who could afford to buy the book, or who might have succeeded in getting the loan of it, it seems that it might have been advisable for Mrs. Eddy to "censor" it before the book appeared. And the worst of it is, that it tempts one to lose confidence in the other contribu-

tions to "science," which otherwise might have been accepted. But perhaps the idea was that they would prepare us for it.

Case 64.—"Many Physical and Mental Troubles Overcome." This is quite a come down from the last one, though if we had not read that, it would have been pretty fair. This lady tells us, after a "mental conflict" so great that "she commenced reading (*Science and Health*) in the hope of obtaining peace, had a very serious eruption on her face, which had been there for two years. We had consulted several physicians, and used every remedy suggested to eradicate it, but they proved useless." The last physician, as she tells us, as the other ones had failed, concluded that it was not worth while to try, and "pronounced it tuberculosis of the skin and incurable."

"A few weeks," the patient tells us, "after I commenced reading, I was amazed to see it almost healed over, and to-day my cheek is perfectly smooth, while the scar is disappearing." Of course, one can't get any more facts in this case; because, as in all the others, first-hand statements from the doctors are not given.

Case 65.—"A New Life Gained." This case is simply that a young man got over the desire for liquor and tobacco by "a few weeks study of *Science and Health*, together with the Bible, and without other help;" and that "ten years have passed and these appetites have never returned." But there is nothing at all in the Bible against a moderate use of "liquor," if wine is included under that name; and nothing whatever about tobacco. Nor does *Science and Health* have anything particular about either. But the contributor of this case asks: "How can we estimate the

value of a book, the study of which brings such transformation and regeneration? Only as we endeavor to live, and strive to practice what it teaches, can we begin to pay our debt to God, and to her whom He has sent to make plain to human understanding the life and teaching of Christ Jusus." Really, one would think that *Science and Health,* and also the Bible, were mainly occupied with the subjects of liquor and tobacco. Perhaps there might be a word or two, here and there, about playing a game of cards, or writing letters on Sunday.

Case 66.—"A Voice from England." This is rather amusing, in a way. "Glasses" again appear on the scene. "I obtained a copy of *Science and Health,* and before a week had passed I realized that if God was my all, I needed no glasses." The same reason would seem to show that she needed no eyes. The testimony of the material senses, as we know, is never of any value, with or without glasses.

Case 67.—"Depraved Appetites Overcome." Here again we have Christian Science alleged as a cure for tobacco, either chewing or smoking, for the drink habit, for profanity, and indeed everything in general. An "inordinate love of money" is mentioned as one of the "lesser ills." St. Paul, however, says that "the love of money is the root of all evils" (1 Tim. vi. 10). We often notice that "scientists" are not very familiar with the Bible, now that it is superseded by Mrs. Eddy's book.

Case 68.—"Catarrh of the Stomach Healed." This is another rather funny case. The patient, we are informed, when "found" by Christian Science, was "suffering from catarrh of the stomach," and also "a slave to the cigarette habit for eighteen years." The

last statement there is no reason to doubt; but for the first a doctor's certificate would be desirable, though it is stated that "I doctored continually;" but perhaps it was on patent medicines. Finally he (it was probably a male patient) got down to three slices of toast, with an unknown number of cigarettes, as a daily allowance. At last he happened to go to a Christian Science church, and was delighted to find that "so great a number actually believed that God does heal the sick to-day." If he had taken trouble to inquire, he could have got the same result in any other church, which did not think it necessary to advertise their belief on this point, and which also believed that people really did sometimes get sick.

"I had dieted so long and suffered so much," the account continues, "that I had a morbid fear of food." But when he "had reached and read, that neither food nor the stomach, without the consent of mortal mind, can make one suffer," he was so far gone that he actually believed it. It could, of course, have been easily shown up as false, by the simple experiment of trying a good dose of tartar emetic; indeed even a Welsh rarebit, if his stomach complaint had any actual existence, would probably have been quite enough. But as it was he simply took some rather light cakes; and as they proved, of course, to be all right, he was encouraged to venture on a hearty dinner.

Case 69.—"Spinal Disease Healed." All that we have here is an entirely unsupported statement that "I have been healed of so-called incurable spinal disease of ten years' standing by studying the Bible and *Science and Health*." Comment is quite unnecessary.

Case 70.—"Many Troubles Overcome." Here we have a mysterious "organic trouble," the nature of

which is not explained; the usual "specialist" comes in as a matter of course; also "blurred eyesight," and "fatigue." At the end we meet the startling statement, that "through reading the textbook I learned that God has given us strength to do all we have to do." Probably it is meant, "all that He wants us to do." But why go to the "textbook" for something that no one ever doubted? Besides, where is this found in the "textbook?" Oh, this one is too silly to go on further with.

Case 71.—"Prejudice Overcome." This case is even thinner than the last. "I was healed of stomach trouble, inward weakness, and bilious attacks." Also of the idea that "I might have to undergo an operation before I could get well;" no reason is given for this.

Case 72.—"A Convincing Testimony." Instead of this being specially "convincing," as claimed, it seems to be decidedly below the average. It principally consists of two cases in which a baby was cured simply by the mother not getting alarmed, and indeed not even continuing to read to her from the textbook, which the baby could not be expected to understand, but by just letting her scream to her heart's content. Croup, whooping cough, tonsilitis, etc., are also vaguely alleged as cured, whether by the same heartless treatment, does not appear.

Case 73.—"Healed Physically and Spiritually." This case is of a very humble (but also as it would seem a rather silly) person; whether a man or a woman, does not clearly appear. These characteristics are chiefly shown in a difficulty of understanding "Christian Science," particularly the "scientific statement of being." What first produced an effect is that the patient, who had a "fear of quick consumption," after

reading the "textbook" on the way to work, and taking a nap instead of going out to luncheon was all right. It is a pity that (he or maybe she had had no opportunity of reading the true "scientific statement of being" in sound philosophical works; but of course (he or she) was as badly off as Mrs. Eddy in that way.

Naturally enough, "eyeglasses" come to the front in this case, as in so many others. The patient's father was also a patient; patiently starving himself on bran, the result of which was that "his limbs seemed so cold that they were kept wrapped in blankets." But he was induced by the junior patient, who did not feel worthy to be a "practitioner," and only acted in that capacity because the father would have no other, to read *Science and Health*. After doing so the old gentleman made up his mind that all that he needed was to have a course of good square meals, instead of the bran, "ate whatever he wanted and used no medicine in any form." "After two treatments, I received word from him that he was healed of that bondage of thirty years standing." The treat of eating "whatever he wanted" was probably even more effective than the "treatments."

Case 74.—"A Voice from the South." There seems to be nothing substantial in this, only a value statement that "through this reading my health was restored, and I was healed of one disease that has been called incurable by all physicians." We have another illusion to the "blessing of having the spiritual fact of being unfolded to me."

Case 75.—"Healed After Much Suffering." Strangely enough in this case "patent medicines" and "one of the best sanitariums in the country" actually did

some good in this case. But the really effective thing was to find by reading *Science and Health* that the "dyspepsia and nervous debility" must be "errors," so, thanks to Mrs. Eddy, who really has done some good in this way, they were healed in about a week.

Case 76.—"Through Great Tribulations." This case is mostly padding, of the usual "scientific" kind. An alleged injury to the spine (no doctor mentioned) and "insomnia," were the trouble.

Case 77.—"A Helpful Testimony." In this case we can only find that the patient had "six years of colds, suffering and coughing, and supposed consumption." But her Eddian experience was remarkable. It seems to have started with Mrs. Eddy's parody on the Lord's Prayer, particularly the Father-Mother part. The "truth of man's spiritual being dawned on my consciousness." Good heavens, how had she been brought up? But she also learned that "she was not subject to mortal laws, as I have been taught all my life. I could not explain how I knew this, but I knew it." Again the wise caution occurs to us, that "it is better not to know so much than to know so much that ain't so." If she had jumped into Niagara Falls, for instance, she would have found herself "subject to mortal laws," all right. But so far as we are informed, the chief proof of her theory is that for "ten years she has not had to lie down in the daytime from any sickness." Isn't it astonishing that presumably rational beings can write such stuff as this?

Case 78.—"Desire for Liquor and Tobacco Disappeared." There is absolutely nothing in this case, except the remarkable statement that when the gentleman who gives it to us first heard of Christian

Science, "drinking and smoking were his comforters, and he had no other companionship." Rather a lonely life, to be drinking and smoking all by oneself all the time.

"When I began to read *Science and Health,* I saw it offered something substantial," he says. Well, that is a funny idea to have of it. Drinking and smoking would be more substantial, to one accustomed to really intellectual occupation, than Mrs. Eddy's vagaries. But it seems he gave up the substance for the shadow. Drinking and smoking are not so bad, in moderate limits, for serious students, especially if they are German.

Case 79.—"An Expression of Loving Gratitude." Well, we are getting nearer still to the shore, and the water gets shallower at every step. Speaking of the book, this one remarks that its originality was startling, "upsetting my preconceived opinions of God, man and creation." In fact, of course, there is no originality whatever in it, as it is simply a sort of amateur statement of pantheism, much better expressed long before, Two idiotic remarks, we are told, "especially appealed to me, namely, 'the foundation of mortal discord is a false sense of man's origin,' and 'for right reasoning, there should be but one fact before the thought, namely, spiritual existence.'"

The common teaching of logic, however, is that two facts are needed before the thought, for any kind of reasoning, right or wrong; that is to say two premises, from which some conclusion, correct or incorrect, is drawn. But this stuff is too great a strain on one's patience.

Case 80.—"Healed of Bright's Disease." This

gentleman tells us that on August 18, 1902, he "was taken down with what three doctors pronounced Bright's disease, and they stated that I would not live a year, or if I did succeed in living longer, I would be mentally unbalanced." It seems that he really must have misunderstood these doctors, for we have never heard of any physician making statements like this, even if they thought so, unless they wished to make the patient "mentally unbalanced," and had an asylum in their control, to which they wished to send him. But nothing of the kind appears. We think then that this case may be reasonably dismissed.

Case 81.—"Fibroid Tumor Destroyed." All that this amounts to is that a physician, name of course not given, informed the lady that she "had a fibroid tumor, which required an operation." As she seems to have declined the operation, it cannot be ascertained whether this opinion was correct or not. But after a considerable time, when visiting a sister in Chicago and feeling quite well, it was determined that the "tumor is gone, for God never made it." It was not, however, ascertained who did make it. Like Topsy, apparently, it just "growed."

Case 82.—"Light out of Darkness." This patient was, it appears, "filled with fear, and bound down by the false gods of this world—sin, disease and poverty." We never heard these called "gods" before. Chronic catarrh, laryngitis and "glasses" were the chief ones. They were overcome, of course, by reading *Science and Health;* we are not told what became of the sin and the poverty. But something is said about having life more abundantly, so perhaps the poverty, at any rate, was also "fixed up" to some extent.

Case 83.—"A Priceless Boon." We had another of these, it seems to us, before. This gentleman, it seems, learned through *Science and Health,* for the first time, that man is the image and likeness of God. Also of "kidney disease and rheumatism." Also of a crooked finger, probably the result of the rheumatism, and of a bunch in his foot. The last, it seems, required "class instruction," whatever that may be. "Profanity, the tobacco habit, and a bad temper," of course.

Case 84.—"Healed of Consumption and Asthma." Of course in this case as in many others, medical evidence would be specially desirable, but is not forthcoming. We are always somewhat puzzled as to what is meant when the patient says, "I continued to study and to put into practice the teaching as best I knew," for we don't see what study a shallow book like the textbook requires, or what there is to "put into practice," except to do nothing at all; though this is a good practice, in many cases.

Case 85.—"A Grateful Testimony." This case is specially interesting in one way, as indicating that one of the "gods" mentioned in No. 82, that is to say, "poverty," gets relief also, sometimes. But all the three, sin, sickness and poverty, are also helped very considerably in the old-fashioned Christian churches, to say nothing of the synagogues, and the many charitable institutions which have been inspired by them; so that, after all, we may be able to get along without this new "science" pretty well; or at least do something in our own poor unscientific way, for those who can't afford to get expensive books, but have to be content with what they absolutely need for body and soul.

GENERAL REMARKS.

We have now gone through all these cases of "fruitage," so-called; that is to say, of practical proofs of the efficacy of "Christian Science." It is of course possible that in some of them the belief of the patients in the power of God to heal the sick without the use of drugs or surgery, which power every Christian acknowledges, may have been rewarded by Him; and such a result would be specially likely to occur in a materialistic age like this, when the possibility of it is so generally denied, not only by absolute infidels, but by non-Catholic Christians, who have been brought up to believe that the "age of miracles" has passed. Even incipient faith might be so rewarded. For they were not test cases, as it were, in which the issue lay between Eddian ideas, and normal Christian ones, or the case recorded in the Third Book of Kings (First Book in the King James version), eighteen chapter, where it lay between Elias (or Elijah) and the prophets of Baal. Outside of such test cases, miracles are not necessarily restricted to the one true and complete faith, as we see, for instance, in the casting out of the devil from the daughter of the Syrophenician woman, recorded in Mark vii.

Some of the cases, however, notably the one which we have numbered sixty-three, we think that most readers will simply reject. To even such, however, the remarks just made can still be applied. Or it is quite possible that the merely natural encouragement given to a patient by the Eddian idea of the non-reality of the illness, may help the recovery from it, however real it may have been to begin with. Or, lastly, in some of the cases adduced as "fruitage" in the

list we have gone over, it is quite probable that the disease itself may have been merely imaginary; or, in other words, that the Eddian diagnosis of it as unreal may have been quite correct. A physician is practically obliged to construct some sort of disease, if the patient insists on it, answering to the symptoms given to him by the patient. If he fails to do so, he is very likely to be dismissed as incompetent.

Of course, as we have noticed while through the cases, the vague certificates to their reality given by *unnamed* physicians are of very little value. Their professional reputation for skill or knowledge does not suffer from them, as long as it is not known who they were. And even if they were known personally to the others who had attended the case, still no doctor likes to say that another is absolutely incorrect in pronouncing a disease as real, though he himself does not believe it to be so; so that a mere agreement as to its reality among those examining it does not amount to very much. And it is noticeable that in some cases the opinions of the doctors who had attended the patient were considerably divergent.

Lastly, we may remark, as a climax, that medical certificates as to the reality of a disease are in themselves rather destructive than constructive, as far as Eddian Science is concerned. It can get along, really, rather better without them than with them. All that has any bearing on this supposed science would be for the patient himself to testify that he fell sick before he took a course of healing by it, and that he felt well after he had taken it.

But as to proving to anyone else, or even to himself, that he had been cured by it, the testimony of the material senses must be resorted to. If it is

alleged, for instance, that a tumor existed before, and has now disappeared, no Scientist, not even the patient himself, can regard this statement as reliable; for every true Scientist regards this the testimony of the senses as entirely deceptive. Nor does it amount to anything that he feels better than he did. For here is simply the testimony of the material senses again.

Nor can anyone not a Scientist be at all impressed in favor of Christian Science by the alleged cure. For if he is to be impressed by it, it must be because he still is under the delusion that there was some real disease under which he was laboring. But as long as he continues in this delusion, he cannot believe in Christian Science. And if he gets over the delusion, that he was sick, and becomes a Scientist, it becomes impossible to prove that he was cured, by any evidence that he can now accept, as we have just seen. It is hard, then, to understand for what kind of people these cures are intended to impress, or why they are published at all. Certainly for none who have logical minds. But there are lots of people whose minds are not logical; so there may be a good many, after all, who will think them quite convincing.

We cannot conclude this review of Mrs. Eddy's absurd book without briefly showing not only its absurdity and illogicality, but also its destructiveness to all real piety or spirituality. This has already been shown, perhaps, sufficiently; but as its impiety is so much worse than its absurdity and folly, more prominence should have been given to this special characteristic of the book, and of the whole Eddian idea.

This impiety consists, fundamentally, in its re-

garding of sin as being merely an "error of mortal mind," having no real existence, instead of being, as it actually is, a real and terrible disease of the passions and of the will. The actual fact, which one does not need to be a Christian (or to believe in the original sin, which is its real and original cause) to recognize, is evident as a fact to all who will open their eyes and see things as they actually are. Even those who choose to ignore its cause, cannot ignore the effect; they cannot possibly deny that in man, as actually at present constituted, there is a prevailing tendency to disobey the clearest commands or prohibitions of his Creator, and made known to him by his conscience. Inanimate and even brute nature conform to the laws given them by God most perfectly; man alone, of all that we see around us, rebels against them. This fatal discord or want of harmony (to use an Eddian term) cannot be overcome by denying it; indeed it cannot be overcome in any way by man's unaided strength, however he may wish or struggle to do so. Indeed, it will naturally not only persevere, but become continually worse and worse, in spite of all our efforts, unless the Almighty Himself comes to our rescue.

True religion holds that He actually has done so, by means of the atonement or reconciliation made by Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Who as St. Paul tells us, "gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and might cleanse to Himself a people acceptable, a pursuer of good works" (Titus ii. 14). But we have our own share to do to bring about this blessed result. We must believe in this Redeemer, must love Him, and continually pray to Him, that He will give us the

strength to accomplish this great work which is His, but with which He requires us to coöperate. The true Christian life is one of constant faith, and love, and prayer, directed to this end. And without it our Redemption will not be accomplished.

All this, however, this so-called Christian (or more correctly antichristian) Science entirely denies. Exalting itself to the throne of God, it tells us that we have no need of His help; that sin is no danger to us, except by our false belief in it; that if we abandon this belief, sin will trouble us no more. And that may be true, it may cease to trouble us; but it will be there all the same.

And it takes from us our indispensable means for overcoming it. The very first step to overcoming it is the confession that we are in ourselves sinners, and in the power of sin, and that escape from this power is impossible without the help of God. It even will not allow us to ask for that help, or to ask Him to "deliver us from evil," but presumptuously tells us instead, in its parody on Our Lord's own prayer, that "He delivers us from sin, disease and death," whether we ask Him to do so or not.

It strikes at the very root and foundation of all the Christian virtues, that is to say of humility, by which each one of us confesses that "I have sinned through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault." And by striking at and demolishing this foundation, it makes all building on it impossible. It substitutes for it an overweening pride, which even calls it a delusion to think that we are not just as good as God Himself. It says a great deal about the love of God for us on His part, but does not ask from us any love on our part for Him; not, at any

rate, any of the only kind of love which it becomes us to show, that of the creature for the Creator, of sinners for the Sinless One. It destroys all piety, which cannot exist, even in the lowest degree, without humility.

Of all the soul-destroying errors which have ever come from the powers of evil on poor humanity, this is the most dangerous, and the most after Satan's own heart. It is the one with which he has most sympathy, for it is his own fatal one of pride, and carried to a greater development than it was ever found among mankind before.

It is also most dangerous, because it has, superficially, such an appearance of good; particularly because in those who are victims to its delusions, it presents such a fair-seeming counterfeit of the joy and peace which Christ promised to His true followers. "Rejoice in the Lord always," St. Paul wrote to the Philippians (Phil. iv. 4). So this false encouragement which this doctrine gives to those who embrace it has naturally a tendency to make them always cheerful and happy. It is, of course, no wonder that it should have such an effect. The idea that God has nothing but good to give to us, no matter whether we deserve it or not, has an effect very similar to that caused to be felt by those who hold the doctrine that the sure promise of eternal salvation which those who have once laid hold on it by "experiencing religion," as the phrase is, cannot in any way be lost; or the doctrine, as it is called, of inamissible justification. This idea, as a matter of course, once thoroughly adopted by anyone in his own individual case, naturally tends to make him content to suffer all the pains and tribulations of this life, sup-

ported by the absolute certainty that, no matter what his conduct may be in this world, he is one of the elect, and is sure to enter immediately after death into eternal happiness, inconceivably surpassing any that can be obtained here.

This sort of confidence, as is quite plain to all who will look at the Scripture cannot be felt, except by means of a special revelation granted to a very few. Even St. Paul himself did not feel it till at the very end, when his martyrdom was, as we may say, in plain sight. He writes in the preceding chapter of this same epistle to the Philippians: "If by any means I may attain to the resurrection which is from the dead. Not as though I had attained, or were already perfect; but I follow after, if I may by any means apprehend, wherein I am also apprehended by Christ Jesus. Brethren, I do not count myself to have apprehended. But one thing I do: forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forth myself to those that are before, I press towards the mark, to the prize of the supernal vocation of God in Jesus Christ."

And again he says (1 Cor. ix. 27): "But I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection; lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway."

It was also at the time of his second epistle to Timothy, just before his death, that he ventured to say: "I am even now ready to be sacrificed; and the time of my dissolution is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. As to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just judge, will render to me in that day" (2 Tim. iv. 6-8).

But we are not, just now, blaming the comparatively

reasonable assurance which the Christian may have of his final perseverance, but rather the absolutely presumptuous one coming from this so-called "Christian Science." The Scientist, as soon as he becomes a Scientist, differs widely from the great Apostle to the Gentiles; and the difference is in his own favor. St. Paul *does* not count himself to have apprehended. But the "Scientist" has apprehended, or learned from his "science," that he is really identified with God, and has all the power of the Almighty at his command.

But there is one respect, beside, in which he differs still more fatally from St. Paul. St. Paul did not expect, did not even desire, to be freed from sufferings in this world. But he thought these a blessing, not a suffering. He exclaims: "That which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory."

And it is well known that St. Paul suffered from the very troubles that "Science" is so determined to free us from, that is to say, from bodily diseases; "infirmities," he calls them. But all he wants to say about them is: "Gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may dwell in me."

The "Scientist," however, wants and expects the power of Christ, and of His "science," to come to his aid, not in the realm of eternity, but right here and now, and for even the smallest ailments; and not for the glory of God, but just simply for his own personal comfort. He presumptuously imagines that he has a right to it, that nothing ought to go wrong "in the realm of Divine Love." If God loves me,

if I am identical with God, he will say, I ought not to, and shall not suffer anything at all.

And God, seeing that he is unwilling to suffer, and determined not to, may perhaps free him from what the saints have regarded as a blessing, and give him the boon on which his heart is set. This, however, only makes him all the more confident that He will always do so. He ought to regard it as a sign not of salvation, but of reprobation; just the same as the giving of riches to those who work and labor for them simply for their own sake. And the smug self-satisfaction and joy which may be seen on the faces of those whose desires for the happiness of this world, whether it be in the way of health, riches or anything else, are granted, are taken by themselves and by others, perhaps, as indications that their religion is the true one; whereas they ought rather to have an opposite meaning.

True Christian joy, however, the "true rejoicing in the Lord always" of which St. Paul speaks in the words already quoted, has always its admixture of sorrow. He describes it himself more fully to the Corinthians: "As sorrowful," he says, "yet always rejoicing; as needy, yet enriching many; as having nothing, and possessing all things" (2 Cor. vi. 10).

Where does the sorrowing come in? It comes, in the first place, from the fear which can never be entirely banished, that, after all, one may fail to possess God, for Whom all else has been sacrificed. This promise that we shall see Him as He is (1 John iii. 2) will hold as long as we do not forfeit it by our own perverse will; but how can we be sure that we shall not? One mortal sin, unrepented, is enough to take it from us; and who can be sure that he will not

fall? That was what St. Paul was afraid of, up to the last moment: "lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway."

And even if we were sure of our perseverance, the Scripture warns, "be not without fear about sin forgiven" (Ecclus. v. 5). Even though forgiven, it is still a danger to us. The same root which gave rise to it, is still in force in us; it is only scotched, not killed, and it is more likely to spring up again in us than if it had never showed its evil head; particularly if it be our ruling passion, as it is called.

But even had we risen to such a height of virtuous habit that this was not to be feared, still there are the sins of others, and especially those for which we may be to blame, which may well cause the good Christian sadness and anxiety. This shadow of sin, even if the reality be gone, cuts off to some extent the full light of God, from our souls, as long as we remain in this sinful world. And the saints feel it more than any others.

This world is not, and cannot be, the place for us to be thoroughly filled with joy. Every joy, even the most spiritual that we can have here, is obscured, more or less, by this cloud of sin which rests upon it. We cannot, indeed, quite understand how, even in heaven, this cloud can entirely pass away. For anyone to be entirely joyful, however united with God, is not possible here at any rate, if he sees things as they actually are. And if he is filled with joy, it is a sign that he does not see things as they are, rather than that he does; a sign that he has not the true religion, rather than that he has.

It is, then, in these fatal spiritual consequences, which we have just considered, rather than in its

intellectual absurdities and inconsistencies, that the chief objection to this false "science" lies. For it may be argued that puzzles or difficulties to our poor human intellect are to be expected in any religious system which comes from God; and that they actually exist in the Christian doctrine as held by any of those who profess it.

But with regard to these spiritual results, the light which, as St. John tells us, "enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world," does enable us to judge. Eddyism is not above our reason, but simply contrary to it.

We have, however, a more sure test of its falsity than any which reason alone can give. It is the same with it as with Mohammedanism, which has no mysteries to puzzle us; but which is stamped most conclusively as false by its appeal to what is evidently and unmistakably our lower nature, rather than our higher.

And it is the same with Eddyism. In spite of the spirituality which it claims for itself, its offering to us is that of physical comfort and well-being. Physical, corporal happiness, not freedom from the spiritual misery which afflicts us, is the bait which it practically holds out to us; the healing of the sick, not the forgiveness of sin. The latter, it is true, we are assured will come together with the former, but it lays little stress on it.

In addition to this fatal defect, as has been said, it puts on our intellect a strain which orthodox Christianity does not. It requires from us the acceptance of statements not beyond the reach of our material intellect, but quite within it, and irreconcilable with it. It is true that many, perhaps most of those who

accept it, have not thoroughly realized these contradictions to our reason which it insists on; but they are plainly there, as any one can see who will take the trouble to examine what has been brought out in the preceding pages of this book, or who carefully will read and ponder its own textbook, *Science and Health*.

But its greatest danger is spiritual, and in a way even more important than what has just been stated. It is that it fosters a spirit of pride and self-sufficiency, instead of that of humility, which, however little it may be put into practice, we all feel in our hearts to be the foundation of all real spiritual excellence and progress in true virtue. Pride, which tries to raise itself to an equality with God, which refuses to recognize the infinite and impassable gap between the creature and the Creator, is a far greater vice than sensuality, or any other which can be named. And it is this Satanic vice which Eddyism endeavors to graft on the natures of those who would otherwise be least inclined to it.

The words of Our Divine Lord, so strongly and so often insisted on by Him, that "whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled," are the most emphatic condemnation of any that can be made of this whole system of so-called "Christian Science."

Date Due

F 11 '44			
FE 12 '53			
MY 13 '53			

BP941 .S41S43
The truth about Christian Science
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00111 5551